



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



911
Waddington

Harvard Divinity School



**ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY**

MDCCCX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

**GIFT FROM
WIDENER LIBRARY**

Samuel May Jr.

Journal of the

LIBRARY OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.

A
HISTORY OF THE CHURCH,
—
FROM
THE EARLIEST AGES
TO
THE REFORMATION.

BY THE REV. GEORGE WADDINGTON, M.A.

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND PREBENDARY OF
FERRING, IN THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF CHICHESTER.

*PUBLISHED UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE SOCIETY
FOR THE DIFFUSION OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.*

VOLUME THE SECOND.

LONDON:
BALDWIN AND CRADOCK, PATERNOSTER ROW.

—
MDCCCXXXIII.

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

H78,052

Feb. 23, 1951

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES,
Stamford Street.

911

Waddington

(Widenor)

CONTENTS OF PART IV.

From the Death of Gregory VII. to that of Boniface VIII.

CHAPTER XVII.

(I.) Papal history—Urban II.—Council of Placentia—that of Clermont—their principal acts—The Crusades—their origin and possible advantage—Pascal II.—Renewed disputes with Henry—his misfortunes, private and public—his death and exhumation—Henry, his son, marches to Rome—Convention with Pascal respecting the regalia—its violation—Imprisonment of the Pope—his concessions—annulled by subsequent Council—Henry again at Rome—Death and character of Pascal—Final arrangement of the investiture question by Calixtus II.—Observations—The first Lateran (ninth general) Council—Death of Calixtus—Subsequent confusion and its causes—Arnold of Brescia—his opinions, fate, and character—Adrian IV.—Frederic Barbarossa—Disputes between them, and final success of the Pope—Alexander III.—his quarrel with Frederic, and advantages—his talents and merits—Celestine III.—The differences between Rome and the Empire—The internal dissensions at Rome on papal election—National contentions between Church and State. (II.) Education and theological learning—Review of preceding ages—in Italy and France—Parochial schools—Deficiency in the materials—Papyrus—Parchment—Consequent scarcity of MSS.—Invention of paper—Three periods of theological literature—the characteristics of each—Gradual improvement in the eleventh century.

CHAPTER XVIII.—Pontificate of Innocent III.

Prefatory facts and observations—Circumstances under which Innocent ascended the chair—Collection of Canons—Condition of the clergy—Ecclesiastical jurisdiction—by what means extended—Innocent's four leading objects—(1.) to establish and enlarge his temporal power in the city and ecclesiastical states—Office of the Prefect—Favourable circumstance, of which Innocent avails himself—his work completed by Nicholas IV.—(2.) to establish the universal pre-eminence of papal over royal authority—His claims to the Empire—His dispute with Philippe Auguste of France—he places the kingdom under interdict—submission of Philippe—His general assertions of supremacy—particular applications of them—to England and France, Navarre, Wallachia and Bulgaria, Arragon and Armenia—His contest with John of England—Interdict—the Legate Pandulph—Humiliation of the King—(3.) to extend his authority within the church—Italian clergy in England—his general success in influencing the priesthood—Power of the Episcopal Order—The fourth Lateran Council. Canons on transubstantiation—on private confession—against all heretics—(4.) to extinguish heresy. The Petrobrussians—their author and tenets. Various other sects, how resisted. The Cathari—supposition of Mosheim and Gibbon the more probable opinion—The Waldenses—their history and character—error of Mosheim—Peter Waldus—his persecution. The Albigens or Albigenes—their residence and opinions—attacked by Innocent—St. Dominic—title of Inquisitor—Raymond of Toulouse—holy war preached against them—Simon de Montfort—resistance and massacre of the heretics. The crusade of children—Continued persecution of the Albigens—Death of Innocent.

CHAPTER XIX.—On the Monastic System.

(I.) Early instance of the monastic spirit in the east—Pliny the philosopher—The Therapeutae or Essenes—The Ascetics—their real character and origin—The earliest Christian hermits—dated from the Decian or Diocletian persecutions—Cœnobites. Pachomius and St. Anthony—originated in Egypt—Basilius of Cæsarea—his order and rule—his institution of a vow questionable—Monasteries encouraged by the fathers of the fourth and fifteenth ages—from what motives—Vow of celibacy—Restrictions of admission into monastic order—Original monks were laymen—Comparative fanaticism of the east and west—Severity and discipline in the west—motives and inducements to it—contrasted with the Oriental practice—Establishment of nunneries in the east. (II.) Introduction of monachism into the west—St. Athanasius—Martin of Tours—Most ancient rule of the western monasteries—their probable paucity and poverty—Benedict of Nursia—his order, and reasonable rule, and object—Foundation of Monte Cassino—France—St. Columban—Ravages of the Lombards and Danes—Reform by Benedict of Aniane—The order of Cluni—its origin, rise, and reputation—its attachment to papacy and its prosperity—The order of Cîteaux—date of its foundation—Dependent Abbey of Clairvaux—St. Bernard—its progress and

X

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

decline—Order of the Chartreux. (III.) Order of St. Augustin—Rule of Chrodegangus—Rule of Aix-la-Chapelle—subsequent reforms. (IV.) Connexion between the monasteries and the Pope—mutual services—The military orders—(1.) The Knights of the Hospital—origin of their institution—their discipline and character—(2.) Knights Templar—their origin and object—(3.) The Teutonic order—its establishment and prosperity. (V.) The mendicant orders—causes of their rise and great progress—(1.) St. Dominic—his exertions and designs—(2.) St. Francis and his followers—compared with the Dominicans—apparent assimilation—essential differences—disputes of the Franciscans with the Popes, and among themselves—Inquisitorial office of the Dominicans, their learning and influence—quarrels with the Doctors of Paris—Austerity of the Franciscans—the Fratricelli—(3.) The Carmelites—their professed origin—(4.) Hermits of St. Augustin—Privileges of these four orders. (VI.) Various establishments of Nuns—their usual offices and character—General remarks—The three grand orders of the Western Church (suited to the ages in which they severally appeared and flourished)—The Jesuits—The Monastic system one of perpetual reformation—thus alone it survived so long—its merits and advantages—The bodily labour of the Monks—their charitable and hospitable offices—real piety to be found among them—superintendence of education, and means of learning preserved by them—limits to their utility—their frequent alliance with superstition—their early dependence on the Bishops—gradual exemption, and final subjection to the Pope—Their profits and opulence, and means of amassing it—Luther a mendicant.

CHAPTER XX.—*From the Death of Innocent III. to that of Boniface VIII.*

The ardour of the Popes for Crusades—its motives and policy—Honorius III.—Frederic's vow to take the cross, and procrastination—Gregory IX.—his Coronation—he excommunicates the Emperor—who thus departs for Palestine—Gregory impedes his success, and invades his dominions—their subsequent disputes—Innocent IV.—his previous friendship with Frederic—Council of Lyons—various charges urged against Frederic—Innocent deposes Frederic and appoints his successor—on his own papal authority—Civil war in Germany—in Italy—death of Frederic—his character and conduct—his rigorous Decree against Heretics—Observations—Other reasons alleged to justify his deposition—this dispute compared with that between Gregory VII. and Henry—Taxes levied by the Pope on the Clergy—Crusade against the Emperor—Exaltation of Innocent—his visit to Italy and intrigues—his death—his qualities as a statesman—as a churchman—expression of the Sultan of Egypt—Alexander IV.—Urban IV.—Clement IV.—Introduction of Charles d'Anjou to the throne of Naples—Gregory X.—his piety, and other merits—Second Council of Lyons—Vain preparations for another Crusade—Death of Gregory—Objects of Nicholas II.—Martin IV.—Senator of Rome—Nicholas IV. diligent against Heresy—Pietro di Morone or Celestine V.—circumstances of his elevation—his previous life and habits—his singular incapacity—disaffection among the higher Clergy—his discontent and meditations—his resignation—Boniface VIII.—his excessive ambition and insolence—on the decline of the papal power—his temporal pretensions—Sardinia, Corsica, Scotland, Hungary—Recognition of Albert King of the Romans—and act of his submission—Philip the Fair—The Gallican Church—origin of its liberties—St. Louis and the Pragmatic Sanction—Differences between Boniface and Philip—Bull Clericis Laicos—its substance and subsequent interpretation—Affairs of the Bishop of Farmers—Bull Ausculta Fili—burnt by Philip—Conduct of the French Nobles—of the Clergy—of Boniface. Bull Unam Sanctam—other violent proceedings—Moderation of Philip—further insolence of the Pope—Philip's appeal to a General Council—William of Nogaret—Personal assault on Boniface—his behaviour and the circumstances of his death.

CHAPTER XXI.

On Louis IX. of France—his religious and ecclesiastical acts and projects—On the origin and establishment of the Inquisition—On some of the principal effects of the Crusades—The Pragmatic Sanction, and the Liberties of the Gallican Church.

CHAPTER XVII.

From Gregory VII. to Innocent III.

THE death of Gregory did not restore either concord to the Church or repose to the Empire. The successor, whom at the solicitation of his cardinals, he nominated on his death-bed, testified a singular, but sincere, repugnance for a dignity, which being probably too feeble to sustain, he was too wise to desire. Desiderius*, Abbot of Mount Cassino, held for a short period, under the name of Victor III., a disputed rule; and on his early death in the year 1087, Urban II., a native of France, was proclaimed in his place. But Clement the Antipope was still in possession of the capital, where the imperial party was triumphant, and five years of dissension† intervened before the authority of Urban was generally acknowledged. That Pope had been a monk of Clugni, and owed his preferment to the See of Ostia to the favour of Gregory; and he continued to the end of his life to exhibit his fidelity by following, as far as his talents permitted him, the schemes which had been traced by his patron.

Of the numerous councils held during his pontificate two are entitled to particular attention—those of Placentia and Clermont‡: in both of these he confirmed the laws and asserted the *Urban II.* principles of Gregory, and carried his favourite claims to their full extent; for by the fifteenth canon of the latter he enacted, ‘that no ecclesiastic shall receive any church dignity from the hand of a layman, or pay him liege homage for it; and that no prince shall give the investiture§.’ But that council is recommended to general history by other and more important recollections. And while at Placentia the final sanction was given to the two strongest characteristics in the doctrine and in the discipline of the Roman Church—namely||, tran-

* His disinclination for the dangerous honour is said to have been so great, that he was actually dragged to the Church, and forcibly invested with the pontifical garments. Fleury, H. E., liv. lxiii., sect. 25 and 27. But this circumstance is not mentioned by Pagi; though, on the authority of Leo Ostiensis, he bears ample testimony to Victor’s reluctance.

† The only remarkable acts of personal hostility which these two rivals appear to have exchanged, was a satiric taunt couched on either side in a pair of very innocent hexameters. Clement, insolent in the possession of the city, wrote to his rustivating adversary as follows:—

Diceris Urbanus, cum sis projectus ab Urbe;
Vel muta nomen, vel regrediaris ad Urbem.

To this Urban replied,

Clemens nomen habes, sed Clemens non potes esse,
Tradita solvendi cum sit tibi nulla potestas.

Hist. Litt. de la France.

‡ Both were held in 1095—the former on March 1, the latter on November 18. At the former were present two hundred bishops, nearly four thousand of the inferior clergy, and more than thirty thousand of the laity; so that the assemblies were held in the open air. The latter appears to have been still more numerously attended. See Fleury, H. E., liv. lxiv., sect. 22. Hist. Litt. de la France.

§ ‘Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligiam fidelitatem faciat.’ See Mosheim, Cent. xi. p. ii. c. ii. Fleury, liv. lxiv., sect. 29.

|| Hist. Litt. de la France. Vie de Berenger. Fleury, loc. cit. The question regarding the ordination of the sons of presbyters, which was warmly debated about this

substantiation and the celibacy of the clergy, it was the Council of Clermont which first sounded that blast of fanaticism which shook the whole fabric of society, from the extremities of the west even to the heart of Asia, for above two centuries.

It may seem strange that the sanguinary project of launching the power of Christendom in one vast armament against the Mahometan conquerors of the Holy Land should first have been proposed by a Pope, who was celebrated for his studious cultivation of the noblest arts of peace. It was Sylvester II.* with whom the scheme of a general crusade originated; but to him it may have been suggested by personal observation of the sufferings of Spain and the humiliation of the Christian name. And to any one beholding and deploring the various disorders of Europe—the fierce contentions of kings with each other, their more fatal dissensions with their subjects, the military license which everywhere prevailed and forbade all security of person or property—it might have seemed an act of comparative mercy to unite those discordant spirits even by the rudest tie, and to divert against a common foe the turbulence which engaged them in mutual destruction. The same measure was not without some justification in prudence; since the slightest caprice of a Saracen conqueror might have directed his rage against Christendom, and especially against Italy, the most attractive, the most exposed, the least defensible province—the centre of the Christian Church, and, as it were, the Palestine of the West. These and similar considerations may have recommended the same project to a much greater mind than that of Sylvester; for it was also (as has been mentioned) a favourite design of Gregory VII., who proposed personally to conduct against the infidel the universal army of Christ. It was realized by Urban II.; and his exhortations† to

time, was set at rest by the Council of Clermont. It was conceded, that with dispensation from the Pope they might be admitted to Holy Orders. Pagi (Vit. Urban. II., sect. 43.) ascribes to this period the practice of administering the Eucharist to the laity under one species only, which, he adds, became more confirmed, after the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem by the crusaders; for in that Church (he maintains) it has existed from primitive times. We may also mention in this place, that the 'Office of the Holy Virgin,' though perhaps not composed by Urban, was brought into more general use during his pontificate.

* It will be recollected that Sylvester, as well as Urban and his agent Peter the Hermit, was a Frenchman. So that the entire credit of the scheme, both of its invention and the bringing it into practice, belongs, such as it is, to that enthusiastic and inconsiderate people. It is a remark of Gibbon, that at the council of Placentia, in Italy, the people wept over the calamities of the Christians of the East—while at Clermont, in France, they took up arms to avenge them.

† The Pope closed the session of the council by a sermon, which has been variously reported by different writers. Fleury gives the following sentences as a part of it, on the authority of William of Tyre, 'a grave and judicious author:—'Do you then, my dear children, arm yourselves with the zeal of God; march to the succour of our brethren, and the Lord be with you. Turn against the enemy of the Christian name the arms which you employ in injuring each other. Redeem, by a service so agreeable to God your pillages, conflagrations, homicides, and other mortal crimes, so as to obtain his ready pardon. We exhort you and enjoin you, for the remission of your sins, to have pity on the affliction of our brethren in Jerusalem, and to repress the insolence of the infidels, who propose to subjugate kingdoms and empires, and to extinguish the name of Christ' Hist. Eccl., Liv. lxiv., sect. 32. As the populace devoutly believed the Pope's assurance, that the pilgrimage would atone for the most abominable crimes, the immediate effect of the crusade might be to rid Europe of the refuse of its population; just as the certain consequence would be the encouragement of crime, when the method of atonement was always at hand.

the Council of Clermont, being at the same time addressed to the superstitious and the military spirit, the two predominant motives of action in that age, were received with an enthusiastic acclamation of frenzy, which was mistaken for the approbation of God.

We do not propose to enter into any description of the military adventures of the crusaders, which have employed the eloquence of so many writers; but shall confine ourselves to the less attractive, but perhaps more useful, task of occasionally recurring to the domestic changes connected with them, and investigating the traces which they have left in the History of the Church.

Urban died in 1099, and was succeeded by Pascal II. Nearly contemporaneous with the decease of Urban was that of Clement III., the Antipope, who had maintained with some interruptions the possession of the capital, though unacknowledged by the great body of the Church. The imperial party was at that moment too weak to appoint a successor, and therefore Pascal entered into undisputed occupation of the chair. Pascal, as well as Gregory and Urban, had been educated in the monastery of Clugni; like the former, he was a Tuscan; like the latter, he was indebted for his early advancement to Gregory; and thus the spirit of that extraordinary man, by animating the congenial bosoms of his two disciples, continued to haunt the pontifical chair, and to regulate the councils of the Vatican, for above thirty years after his departure*. And if Urban prosecuted the reforms undertaken by his master, and realized one of his fondest speculations, to Pascal remained the more difficult and odious office of resuming with fresh violence the interrupted contest with the empire. He engaged in it earnestly, if not eagerly; and as the emperor was still unprepared for submission, he prevented an attempt (perhaps an insidious attempt) at compromise, by renewing (in 1102) all former decrees against investitures, and then commenced the conflict by the usual sentence of excommunication.

Henry IV., after surviving so many Popes, was still in possession of the throne; but his latter years had been afflicted by the rebellion, and, what might be less bitter to him, by the death of his eldest son. The affections of his subjects he never possessed nor deserved; but we do not learn that by any domestic delinquency he had forfeited the less dissoluble allegiance of his children. And yet, scarcely had Conrad terminated his unnatural impiety by death, when—as if the anathemas of Gregory were still suspended over him—as if to accomplish the *temporal* retribution which that pontiff had denounced against the foes of St. Peter†—Henry, his other son, on learning the excommunication of his father, rose in arms against him. A scene revolting to nature and humanity was the consequence; and even the death of the Emperor, which speedily followed, does not close the story of his persecutions. His body, which was still lying under the anathema, having been inconsiderately consigned to consecrated ground, was imme-

* Pascal died on January 18th, 1118, after an unusually long pontificate of eighteen years, five months, and five days.

† It will be recollected that, in his second excommunication of Henry, Gregory supplicated St. Peter to take away from that prince prosperity in war and victory over his enemies, 'that all the world may know' (says he) 'that thou hast power both in heaven and on earth.'

diately dug up, ejected from the holy precincts, and condemned to an unhallowed sepulchre*; and there it rested for the space of five years, a revolting monument of papal power and papal malignity: at length the sentence was withdrawn†, and Henry V. was permitted to make a tardy atonement to offended nature and piety.

There is no proof that Pascal positively excited this monstrous rebellion, but it is well known that he countenanced and promoted it, and that too, not as a reluctant concession of virtue to interest, but with ardent and uncompromising zeal. Indeed, his interest was not engaged in this matter, but his passions merely, and the vindictive hatred for Henry IV. which he had contracted in the school of Gregory. The Holy See had nothing to gain by the death or deposition of an unpopular monarch, but everything to fear from the union which would probably ensue among his subjects. For, as to any prospect of gratitude from his successor—any hope that the Emperor would be mindful of services conferred upon the rebel,—a Tuscan and a Pope could scarcely indulge so simple an expectation. If Pascal did so, he very speedily discovered his error; for scarcely was Henry IV. dead, when his son asserted with equal vehemence the disputed rights. The Pope resisted, and both parties prepared for a second struggle.

Henry V. nothing deterred by the portentous appearance of a comet, which inspired general dismay, descended into Italy during the summer of 1110, carefully prepared for a twofold contest with the Holy See; for he was not only attended by a powerful army, but also by a suite of *literary* protectors‡, so that the pen might be at hand to justify the deeds of the sword. His advance was preceded by a declaration of his intention, which was 'to maintain a right acquired by privilege and the custom of his predecessors from the time of Charlemagne, and preserved during three hundred years under sixty-three popes—that of presenting to bishoprics and abbeys by the ring and crosier.' In reality, his object, when more fully explained, was to prevent the election of bishops without his consent, to invest the bishop-elect with the regalia, to receive from him homage and the oath of allegiance. At the same time, he proposed to undergo the solemn ceremony of coronation at the hands of the Pope.

By the regalia above mentioned were understood various grants conferred on the bishops by Charlemagne, which partook of the privileges of royalty, such as the power of raising tribute, coining money, and also the possession of certain independent lands, directly derived from the crown, with some other immunities. And it seemed natural that the successors of Charlemagne should retain the right of confirming

* 'Comprobantibus his qui aderant Archiepiscopis et Episcopis; quia quibus vivis ecclesia non communicat, illis etiam nec mortuis communicare possit.'—Urspergensis Abbas, ap. Pagi, Vit. Pascalis II. Some ascribe this act of barbarity to the German Bishops, and exculpate the Pope, except in as far as he had set them the example, by exhumating the bones of Guibert the Antipope, who had been buried at Ravenna, and casting them into the neighbouring river.

† Fleury, H. E., lib. lxxv. s. 44, and lib. lxxvi. s. 5.

‡ One of them was a Scotsman named David, who had presided over the schools at Wurtemberg, and whom the King had appointed his chaplain, *à cause de sa vertu*. He wrote a relation of this expedition, but rather as a panegyrist than a historian.—Fleury, lib. lxxvi. s. 1, on authority of Will. Malmes., lib. v. p. 166.

the privileges which he had bestowed. This circumstance involved the Pope in great perplexity; and though it was easy to publish edicts, and advance vague and exorbitant pretensions, when the Emperor was distant or embarrassed, he could scarcely hope by such expedients to withstand his near and armed approach. In this difficulty, Pascal proved at least the sincerity of his professions, and his attachment to the best and purest interests of the Church. He had the virtue to prefer its spiritual independence to its worldly splendour, and the courage to proclaim his preference. This better part being chosen, he concluded a treaty with Henry, by which it was agreed that the bishops, on the one hand, should make to Henry a positive cession of all that belonged to the crown in the time of Louis, Henry, and his other predecessors, on pain of excommunication if they attempted to usurp such regalia; and that the Emperor, on the other, should resign the right of investiture. On this arrangement, the Pope consented to perform the ceremony of coronation*, and Henry proceeded to Rome for that purpose.

The circumstances which followed are told with some trifling variations, but were probably thus. The bishops interested in the treaty, and especially those of Germany, who would have been the greatest sufferers, felt the deepest repugnance to resign so large a portion of their splendid temporalities for a remote and invisible object, which, however it might be accessory to the honour of the Church, did not benefit their own immediate interests. Consequently they protested with so much violence against the compromise, which seemed to them to exchange a substance for a shadow, that the Pope despaired of his power to execute that condition of the treaty. In the mean time, Henry arrived at Rome: he was conducted with acclamations to the Basilica of St. Peter, where the Pope, with his Bishops and Cardinals, was waiting to receive him. The King, according to the accustomed ceremony, prostrated himself before the Pope, and kissed his feet; he then read the usual oath, and they advanced together into the church†. But here, before they proceeded to the office of consecration, a dispute broke out respecting the fulfilment of the treaty, and it was presently inflamed into an angry quarrel. Henry availed himself of the presence of his soldiers to arrest the Pope and several Cardinals; the Roman populace took arms and endeavoured to rescue him; a fierce and tumultuous conflict ensued, and the courts of the Vatican, and even the hallowed pavement of St. Peter, were polluted with blood; but the Germans succeeded in preserving their prisoners, and carried them away to their neighbouring encampment at Viterbo. After a rigorous confinement of two months, Pascal yielded to such persuasion as a king may exercise over his captive; and then he not only performed the required ceremony, but, by a new convention, ceded unconditionally the right of investiture.

* For this compact we have the authority of Petrus Diaconus (who cites a contemporary account of the transaction) confirmed by that of Urspergens. Abbas, as follows. 'Ibi Legati Apostolici cum missis Regis advenientes, promptum esse Papam ad consecrationem... si tamen ipse sibi annueret libertatem Ecclesiarum, laicam ab illis prohibens investituram—recipiendo nihilominus ab Ecclesia Ducatus, Marchias, Comitatus, Advocatias, Moneta, Telonia, cæterorumque Regalium quæ possident summam.'—See Pagi, Vit. Pasch. II.—Fleury, lib. lxvi. a. ii.

† This took place on Feb. 11, 1111. 'Ter se invicem complexi, ter se invicem osculati sunt; et, sicut mos, Rex dexteram Pontificis tenens cum magno populi gaudio et clamore ad Portam venit Argenteam. Ibi ex libro professionem imperatoriam faciens a Pontifice designatus est Imperator, &c.'—Acta Vaticana ap. Baronium.

The presence of the Emperor was demanded in Germany; Pascal returned to Rome; but he was saluted there by such a tempest of indignation, as to find it necessary, in the year following, to submit the whole affair, even as it involved his own personal conduct, to a very numerous Council at the Lateran. Here the Pope confessed the error into which his weakness had betrayed him; and the Council, with his consent, solemnly revoked and cancelled the treaty, and justified their perfidy by pleading the violence which had extorted it. The immediate resentment of Henry was diverted by civil disorders; but in 1117, he marched to Rome as an avowed enemy; Pascal retired to Benevento, and sought the protection of his Norman vassals, still faithful to the chair of Gregory. The Emperor presently withdrew, and Pascal returned to his see, and died; and his fortunes, in many respects similar to those of his patron, were blessed with a happier termination, since he was permitted to close his eyes at Rome. His fortunes were, in some respects, similar to those of Gregory, and similar was the audacity of his pretensions; but he wanted the firmness necessary to dignify the former, and to give weight and stability to the latter; his adversity was inglorious, and his arrogance feeble and without consequence. The levity of his character disqualified him for the task he had undertaken, and its pliance did not compensate for its want of coherence and consistency.

The question respecting investitures, after having variously agitated the kingdoms of the west for half a century, was now drawing near to its final decision. After a short interval of disputed succession*, then usual on the death of every Pope, Calixtus II., Archbishop of Vienna, a Count of Burgundy, and a near relative of the Emperor, was raised to the pontifical chair. It does not appear, however, that he sacrificed to the claims of consanguinity any portion of the rights or pretensions of his see; but he consented that the differences should be submitted for their final arrangement to a Council, or Diet, to be assembled at Worms for that purpose. A Convention was there concluded, which was reasonable and permanent; its substance was this†:—(1.) That the election of bishops and abbots, in his Teutonic kingdom, take place in its rightful form, without violence or simony, in the presence of the Emperor or his legate, so that in case of a difference, his protection be given with the advice of the metropolitan to the juster claim‡. (2.) That the ecclesiastic elected receive his regalia at the hand of the Emperor, and do homage for them. But (3.) that in the ceremony of investiture the Emperor no longer use the insignia of spiritual authority, but the *sceptre* only. A similar arrangement had previously§ taken place in England between Henry I. and Pascal II.; and in France||, if the custom of investiture by the ring and crosier ever

* Gelasius II. stands in the list of Popes as having filled that interval.

† See Fleury, liv. lxvii. sect. 30. Pagi, Vit. Callisti II. sect. xxiv. xxv. This convention took place in September, 1122.

‡ 'Si qua inter partes discordia emeruerit, metropolitani provincialium consilio vel judicio, saniori parti assensum et auxilium præbeas.' So this clause is expressed in the acts of the Lateran Council held in the following year.

§ Probably in 1106, after a severe dispute between the Pope and King during the primacy of Anselm. Hist. Litt. France, Vie Pascal. Pagi, Vit. Pascal. II.

|| Guillaume de Champeau, Bishop of Chalons, is related to have addressed (in 1119) the following discourse to the Emperor:—'Sire, if you desire a substantial peace you must absolutely renounce the investiture to bishoprics and abbeys. And to assure you that you will thus suffer no diminution of your royal authority, let me inform you, that when I was

prevailed, which seems uncertain, it had been abolished about the same time.

The terms of this treaty, in which each party yielded what was extravagant in his claims*, were undoubtedly favourable to the Church. Her restitution of the 'rightful form' of election deprived the Emperor of an usurped privilege which had been extremely valuable and profitable to him, both in its use and its abuse. And since the Popes, ever after the edict of Alexander II., had claimed as indisputable the right of *confirmation* in episcopal election—a claim which, as it was purely ecclesiastical, the Emperor had not greatly cared to contest—a large portion of the influence which was ceded by the crown did in fact *devolve* on the holy see. Again, the *original* form of election was in no case positively restored, since the advantage of excluding the people, and even the body of the diocesan clergy, had been long and generally acknowledged; so that the right seems to have been invested almost immediately in the chapters of the cathedral Churches; at least it was confirmed to them about the end of the twelfth century.

The second condition of the Convention secured to the sovereign the civil allegiance of his ecclesiastical subjects, and repressed their dangerous struggles for entire immunity from feudal obligations. At the same time it restored to them the integrity of their ghostly independence, and cut off the last pretence for secular interference in matters strictly spiritual.

So easy and reasonable was the conclusion of that debate, which, in addition to the usual calamities of international warfare, had excited subjects against their sovereign, and children against their fathers, which had convulsed the holy Church, and overthrown its sanctuaries, and stained its altars with blood. However, on a calm historical survey of the circumstances of the conflict, and of the crimes and errors which led to them, we are little disposed to load with unmixed reprehension any individual of either party. The *crimes*, indeed, and the passions which produced them, were equally numerous and flagrant on either side; on the one, were tyranny and profligacy and brutal violence: arrogance and obstinacy and imposture, on the other; pride and ambition and injustice, on both. Yet our prejudices naturally incline to the imperial party; because the same or equal vices become infinitely more detestable when they are found under the banners of religion†. But the *errors* were those of the

*elected in the kingdom of France, *I received nothing from the hand of the king*, neither before nor after consecration. Nevertheless I serve him as faithfully in virtue of the tributes and various other rights of the state which Christian kings have in ancient days given to the Church, as faithfully, I say, as your bishops in your kingdom serve you, in virtue of that investiture which has drawn such discords and anathemas on you.' Fleury, H. E. liv. lxviii. sec. 3. The Emperor yielded to that argument.

* The peace of the Church is thus celebrated by Gotfridus of Viterbo, in his Chronicle:

Reddit Apostolico Cæsar quæcunque rogavit;

Pax bona conficitur; sublata Deo reparavit;

Jura suæ partis lætus uterque trahit.

† Mosheim is disposed to throw all the reproach of this dispute on the *monastic* education and character of Gregory and his two disciples; and these he contrasts with the more secular virtues which high birth and society had nourished in Calixtus. But in the first place, the whole blame is not by any means on that side, but is very equally divided with the empire; and in the next, Pascal at least did actually prove, by his arrangement with the English king, his disposition to end the controversy, on the very terms finally accepted by Calixtus. Mosheim moderates with great impartiality between contending sects, and a very great merit that is; but when the contest is between a Pope and a German sovereign, his feelings sometimes overpower his perfect judgment.

times rather than of the men, and even served, in some degree, to palliate the crimes. The barbarism of preceding ages and the ignorance actually existing, had engendered and nourished a swarm of obscure notions and active prejudices, which infatuated the vulgar, and partially blinded even the best and the wisest. The records of past events were little studied; indeed they were seen only by those discontinuous glimpses, which perplex and deceive far more than they enlighten; and reason had lost her native force, and health, and penetration, through neglect and abuse—so that claims the most absurd were established by arguments the most senseless; and men could not rightly discern the real nature of their adversaries' pretensions, nor even the strength of their own, so as effectually to controvert the one, or rationally to maintain the other. Thus were their contests carried on in a sort of moral obscurity, which took off nothing from their positiveness and obstinacy, and permitted even additional licence to their malignity.

In the following year a very numerous* assembly was held at Rome, which is commonly acknowledged in that Church as the *The First Lateran Council.* ninth General, and the First Lateran council. Of the two-and-twenty canons which resulted from its labours, the greater part were in confirmation of the acts of preceding Popes; and we observe that the object of several of the original enactments was to protect the property of the Church from alienation, and lay usurpations. There was one which promoted the Crusading zeal, both by spiritual promises and menaces. And among the most important we may consider that (the 17th) which prohibited abbots and monks from the performance of public masses, the administration of the holy chrism, and other religious services, and confided those solemn offices entirely to the secular clergy. This was an early and very public manifestation of that jealousy between the two orders of the Romish hierarchy, which in a later age displayed itself so generally as to become an efficient instrument in working its overthrow.

Calixtus died in 1124, and during the thirty years which followed, the pontifical city enjoyed scarcely any intermission from discord and convulsion. The names of Honorius and *Popular tumults at Rome.* Innocent †, and Anaclete and Eugenius, with some others, pass by in rapid and tumultuous procession. The chair, which was generally contested, was never maintained to any good purpose; and one of its possessors, Lucius II., was actually murdered by the populace in an attempt to restore tranquillity.

But we must here observe, that the popular commotions of this period were not of the same description with those which we have already found occasion to notice; the question of papal election had ceased to be their sole, or even their principal, cause; the turbulence which had been occasioned by the abuse of that right, and prolonged by the endeavour to reclaim it, was now founded in a deeper and much more powerful motive. A party had lately grown up in the Roman city of patriots ambitious to restore the name, and, as some might fondly deem, the glory of the ancient republic.

* About a thousand prelates were present, of whom above three hundred were bishops, and above six hundred abbots. Many pontifical Councils had been previously held at the Lateran, but this was the first which obtained a place among the General Councils.

† The Pontificate of Innocent II., though interrupted by frequent dissension, was the longest and the most important; and during it, in the year 1139, the tenth General Council, or second Lateran, was assembled.

And the first and necessary step towards the accomplishment of this scheme was the subversion, or, at least, the entire reconstruction of the ecclesiastical system. To diminish the privileges, to reduce the revenues of the church, to deprive the Pontiff of temporal power and all civil jurisdiction, and to degrade (should we not rather say, to exalt?) his stately splendour to the homeliness of his primitive predecessors—these were the projects preparatory to the political regeneration of Rome. About the year 1135, Arnold, a native of *Arnold of Brescia*. Brescia, a disciple of the celebrated Abelard, returned to Italy from the schools of Paris, and having assumed the monastic habit, began publicly to preach and declaim against the vices of the clergy. It is admitted by a Catholic writer*, that the pomp of the prelates, and the soft licentious life both of clerks and monks, furnished abundant materials for his denunciations; but it is complained that he exceeded the limits of truth and moderation; and it is besides asserted, that his orthodoxy was liable to suspicion, and that he held some unsound opinions respecting the Eucharist and infant baptism. In consequence of these various charges, he was condemned by a Lateran Council, in 1139: he immediately retired from Italy, and transferred his popular declamation to Zurich, in Switzerland.

Not many years afterwards, encouraged by the independent spirit which was rising at Rome, he boldly selected that metropolis for the scene of his two-fold exertions against papacy and des- *Adrian IV.* potism. In the mean time (in the year 1154) a man of decided firmness and energy had obtained possession of the Chair. Adrian IV., the only Englishman who ever attained that dignity, had raised himself from the very lowest office in society† to the throne of St. Peter; and though the arrogance which he then exhibited might entirely belong to his latest fortunes, an intrepid resolution, tempered by the most refined address, must have characterised every stage of his progress; since these are qualities which offices and dignities may exercise, but can never bestow. In the year following his elevation, one of his cardinals was dangerously wounded in some tumult excited by the associates of Arnold. Adrian instantly placed the city of Rome under an interdict; the churches were closed, and the divine offices for some time suspended, in the very heart of the Catholic church. The priests and the people wearied the pontifical chair with supplications for a recall of the edict, but Adrian did not relent until Arnold and his associates were expelled from the city. 'All the people (says Fleury) blessed God for this mercy: on the following day (Holy Thursday), they rushed from every quarter to receive the customary absolution, and a vast multitude of pilgrims was also present. Then the Pope, attended by bishops and car-

* Fleury, H. E., lib. lxxviii., sect. 55. Arnold maintained that there was no hope of salvation for prelates who held baronies, or for any clerks or monks who possessed any fixed property; that those possessions belonged to the prince, and that he alone could bestow them, and on laymen only; that the clergy ought to live on the tithes and the voluntary oblations of the people, content with a moderate and frugal sufficiency. Pagi, Vit. Innocent II., sect. lix., refers to Otho Frisingensis. The ravings (deliramenta) of Peter de Bruis were condemned on the same occasion. That Heresiarch objected to the reverence paid to the cross, denied the daily sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, and the efficacy of prayers or alms for the dead, besides other unpardonable errors.

† His name was Nicholas Breakspere: going to Arles, in Provence, he was admitted in the quality of servant to the Canons of St. Rufus, where he became monk, and in the sequel Abbot and General of the Order.

dinals, and a numerous troop of nobles, came forth from his residence; and crossing the extent of Rome, amidst the acclamations of the people, arrived at the Lateran Palace, where he celebrated the festival of Easter.*

Soon afterwards, Arnold unhappily fell into the power of Frederic Barbarossa, who was then in Italy on his advance to Rome; and the Emperor, probably actuated by a common dislike to independence and innovation under every form, yielded up his prisoner to the solicitations of the Pope. He was conducted to Rome, and subjected to the partial judgment of an ecclesiastical tribunal. His guilt was eagerly pronounced, the prefect of the city delivered his sentence, and he was burnt alive, 'in the presence of a careless and ungrateful people.' But lest this same multitude, with the same capriciousness, should presently turn to adore *the martyr* and offer worship at his tomb, his ashes were contemptuously scattered over the bosom of the Tiber. His name has been the subject of splendid panegyric and scandalous calumny: with its claims to political celebrity, we have no concern in this history; but in respect to his disputes with the church, we may venture to rank Arnold of Brescia among those earnest but inconsiderate reformers, whose premature opposition to established abuses produced little immediate result except their own discomfiture and destruction; but whose memory has become dear, as their example has been useful, to a happier and a wiser posterity; whom we celebrate as martyrs to the best of human principles, and whose very indiscretions we account to them for zeal and virtue.

Frederic Barbarossa, whose elevation was nearly contemporaneous with that of Adrian, had also announced his intention to restrain the increasing wealth and moderate the insolence of the Pope and his clergy; and in 1155, he proceeded to Rome for the purposes of celebrating his coronation, and commencing his reform: but he found the Pontiff as firm and as powerful to resist imperial interference as to quell domestic disorder. And so far was Adrian, on this occasion, from betraying the interests of his order, or the prerogatives of his office, that he even asserted a recent and ambiguous and singularly offensive claim—he demanded the personal service of the Emperor to hold his stirrup when he mounted his horse*. A precedent for this indignity having been pointed out to him, Barbarossa, the haughtiest prince in Europe, at the head of a powerful and obedient army, submitted to an office of servitude, which he may possibly have mistaken for Christian humiliation. But, however that may be, the triumph of the See over so great a monarch proved the substantial reality of its power, and the awe which it deeply inspired into the most intrepid minds.

Some vexatious pretensions of Adrian respecting the regalia, and a gratuitous insinuation that Frederic held the empire as a fief (beneficium) from Rome, served to keep alive a jealous irritation between the Church and the empire, though peace was not actually interrupted. Frederic, on the other hand, published, in 1158, an edict, of which the object was to prevent the transfer of fiefs without the knowledge and consent of the superior or lord in whose name they were held. It was by such unauthorized transfers of feudal property that the territories of the Church had

* 'This homage' (says Gibbon) 'was paid by kings to archbishops, and by vassals to their lords; and it was the nicest policy of Rome to confound the marks of filial and feudal subjection.' Chap. 69.

for a long period been gradually swollen, so as to spread themselves in every direction over the surface of Europe. The law in question was well calculated to check their further increase, and it seems to have been the first that was enacted for that purpose. Its obvious tendency did not escape the directors of the Church; but the opposition which it had peculiarly to expect from the Holy See was suspended by the death of Adrian and the confusion which followed it.

Alexander III. was immediately elected by a very large majority of the cardinals; but as some of the other party still persisted in supporting a rival named Octavian*, Frederic, on his own authority, summoned a General Council at Pavia to decide on their claims. Alexander disputed the Emperor's right to arbitrate or at all to interfere in the schisms of the Church†; and, as he refused to present himself at the Council, his rival was declared to be duly elected, and the decision received the approbation of the Emperor. But Alexander was still sustained by the more faithful and powerful party within the Church, and acknowledged by most of the sovereigns of Europe; and from these supports he derived confidence sufficient to excommunicate his adversary, and to absolve his subjects from their oath of fidelity. But Frederic did not feel the blow; he proceeded to place his creature in possession of the pontifical city, while Alexander adopted the resolution, so commonly followed by his successors in after ages, to seek security in the territories of France. He withdrew to Montpellier with his whole court, and resided in that neighbourhood for the space of three years, till circumstances enabled him to return to Rome in 1165. Here he was soon afterwards assailed by Frederic in person, and though defended for some little time by the ambiguous and vena fidelity‡ of the Romans, he was finally obliged to escape in the disguise of a pilgrim. He retired to Benevento, but not till he had thundered another anathema against Frederic; and on this occasion he not only deprived him of the throne, but also forbade, 'by the authority of God, that he should thereafter have any force in battle, or triumph over any Christian; or that he should enjoy anywhere peace or repose, until he had given sufficient proofs of his penitence.§' The denunciations contained in this frightful sentence were not, indeed, wholly accomplished; yet did it so come to pass, that Frederic was obliged to retire almost immediately from Rome by the sickness of his army; and that, in the long and destructive war which followed, he suffered such reverses as to find it expedient (in the year 1177) to sign a disadvantageous treaty with the Pope||. The war

* After the death of Octavian, Alexander had still to struggle successively with three other Antipopes. The second, called by his adherents Calixtus III., was appointed in 1168, and abdicated in about ten years; but his party replaced him by another puppet, whom they called Innocent III.

† Frederic had two precedents for his claim, though he might not perhaps much regard, or even know, that circumstance. In 408 Honorius held a Council at Ravenna to decide the disputed election between Boniface and Eulalius, and his decision was followed by the Church. Afterwards the schism between Symmachus and Laurentius was terminated by Theodoric, though an Arian. The imperial power does not appear to have been disputed in either instance.

‡ It appears that he could secure little influence over the Roman people, 'who, pretending to wish well to both parties, were faithful to neither,' until he received a large sum of money from William, his Sicilian vassal. Fleury, H. E., liv. lxxi., sec. 34, &c. &c.

§ See Pagi, Vit. Alexandri III., sect. 66, who reasonably assigns this event to the year 1167.

|| Alexander is accused, and with some justice, of having too exclusively consulted his own interests in this affair, and of having negotiated a truce only for his faithful allies,

was for the most part carried on in the North of Italy; and as it was fomented by the address and policy, rather than by the sword, of Alexander, the calm expression of his exultation was in some manner justified—'it hath pleased God (he said) to permit an old man and a priest to triumph without the use of arms over a powerful and formidable emperor*.'

From that time Alexander possessed in security the chair which he had merited by his persevering exertions, as well as by his various virtues. He immediately turned his attention to the internal condition of the Church, and his first object was to remove from his successors an evil which had so long and so dangerously afflicted himself. Accordingly he summoned (in 1179) a Council, commonly called the third of Lateran, and there enacted those final regulations† respecting papal election which have already been mentioned.

Among the very few characters which throw an honourable lustre upon the dark procession of pontifical names, we may confidently record that of Alexander III., not only from the splendour of his talents, his constancy, and his success, but from a still nobler claim which he possesses on our admiration. He was the zealous champion of intellectual advancement, and the determined foe of ignorance. The system of his internal administration was regulated by this principle, and he carried it to the most generous extent. He made inquiries in foreign countries, and especially in France, for persons eminent for learning, that he might promote them, without regard to birth or influence, to the highest ecclesiastical dignities. He caused large numbers of the Italian Clergy, to whom their own country did not supply sufficient means of instruction, to proceed to Paris for their more liberal education; and having learnt that in some places the chapters of cathedrals exacted fees from young proficients before they licensed them to lecture publicly, Alexander removed the abuse, and abolished every restriction which had been arbitrarily imposed on the free advance of learning. At the same time he was not so blinded by this zeal as to consider the mere exercise of the understanding as a sufficient guarantee for moral improvement. But observing, on the contrary, with great apprehension the progress of the scholastic system of theology, and the numberless vain disputations to which it gave rise, he assembled a very large Council of Men of Letters‡ for the purpose of condemning that system, and discouraging its prevalence at Paris.

He died in 1181: in the course of the ten following years four pontiffs ruled and passed away, and in 1191 the chair was occupied by Celestine III., the fifth from Alexander. This prelate has deserved a place in the history of mankind by the protection which he afforded to Richard I. of England, when imprisoned on his return from the Holy Land. He died in 1198, and was succeeded by Lotharius, Count of Segni, a Cardinal Deacon, who assumed the name of Innocent III.

* while he secured an honourable and profitable peace for himself. Denina (Rivol. d' Ital. L. xi. C. iv.) calls it a '*Pace particolare fra Alessandro III. e Federico.*'

* Muratori, in his forty-eighth dissertation, describes Frederic as '*Vir alti animi, acris ingenii, multarumque virtutum consensu ornatus.*'

† These regulations were so effectual, that during the 600 following years, a double choice (as Gibbon observes) only once disturbed the unity of the College. Chap. 69.

‡ Three thousand gens de lettres are said to have been assembled on that occasion. Hist. Litt. de la France, xii. siècle.

We shall conclude this account with a few of the observations which most naturally offer themselves. From the moment that the Roman See put forward its claims to temporal authority, its history presents a spectacle of contentions, varying indeed in character and in bitterness, but in their succession almost uninterrupted. The retrospect of the period of one hundred and fifteen years, of which the most memorable circumstances have now been related, presents to us a mass of angry dissensions, which may generally be distinguished into three classes: (1.) The first and most prominent of these contains such quarrels as arose in continuation of the grand debate between the popedom and the empire. It was not sufficient that the original matter of dispute was removed by the concordat of Calixtus; the roots of animosity lay deeper than the form of an investiture, and they had branched out more widely and more vigorously during the contest which succeeded that concordat. The coronation of every new emperor was now attended by a new dispute, which usually caused immediate bloodshed, and was sometimes prolonged into obstinate warfare. Rome had never a more formidable German adversary than Frederic Barbarossa; yet so far was he from obtaining any lasting advantage over her, that the papal pretensions appear to have gained considerably both in consistency and general credit during his reign, or, to speak more properly, during the pontificate of Alexander III. Frederic was not justified in contesting the legitimacy of that pontiff. Whatsoever general rights he might possess over the Roman church (and they were very vague and could only be temporal); whatsoever precedents he might plead for interference (and those were very remote, and not wholly applicable to the present case); the election of Alexander was unquestionably valid, according to the canons which had been enacted a century before and never repealed or contested, and according to the practice of the See since the days of Gregory VII. Assuredly, the desire to recover an obsolete privilege, virtually ceded by the silence of intervening treaties, was excuse insufficient for that violent opposition, which did properly terminate in defeat and humiliation, as it was commenced and continued in injustice. (2.) The contentions among the rival candidates for the pontifical chair, so scandalous and so usual in former periods, had abated nothing of their rage in the present; for though they changed their character, they lost not any part of their virulence, from the intermixture of political animosity. The short reigns of the greater number of the pontiffs, and the most trifling divisions in the college, gave frequent occasion, and some pretext, for popular interference; and this could never be exercised without excess. The regulation of Nicholas II. was not in fact of much real advantage, except as a preparatory measure to that of Alexander III.,—for it was vain to exclude from positive election an unprincipled and venal mob, as long as they retained a negative influence,—it was of no avail, as a final arrangement, to forbid their suffrage, and to require their consent,—for the turbulent expression of their disapprobation was instantly seized by the defeated candidate, as furnishing some hope for success, or, at least, some plea for perseverance. And perhaps it was not the least evil of those tumults, that they encouraged and almost invited the interference of the emperor, so seldom offered with any friendly intention. There was no other possible method of securing at once the justice and decency of papal election, than by the entire exclusion of the people—this measure was at length effected by Alexander. (3.) Of another description again were those dissensions which distracted the several kingdoms of Europe

by the internal division of the church and the state,—that is, by the opposition of the ecclesiastical to the civil authorities. But since in these matters the affairs of every nation constitute histories essentially distinct from each other, and mainly influenced, in every instance, by civil concerns; and since the detached incidents which we might produce would form independent narratives, standing for the most part on separate foundations, it would be difficult, in these limited pages, to give them consistency, or even coherence. We must, therefore, content ourselves with referring to the annals of the different nations for the details of such disputes; to those of France, for instance, for the quarrel between Louis le Gros and the Bishop of Paris, who had the boldness to excommunicate his sovereign; and to those of our own country for the particulars of the aggression of William Rufus on the property of the church, made during the pontificate of Urban II., and of the protection perseveringly vouchsafed to Thomas à Becket by the piety or policy of Alexander III.

To those abovementioned we might reasonably add another form of discord which was beginning obscurely to present itself, with omens and menaces of tribulation. The voice of heresy had been already raised in the valleys of France, and the ministers of spiritual despotism had already bestirred themselves for its suppression. But this subject is so peculiarly connected with the celebrity of Innocent III., that we shall not disconnect it from his name.

II. The gradual establishment of the peculiar doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, though occasionally influenced by the vicissitudes of literature, is not inseparably connected with its history, but was promoted in different ages by very different causes. It is indeed remarked, that in the tenth century the disputes respecting predestination and other subtle questions became less common, and gave place to the final establishment of the doctrine of Purgatory,—a change well suited to the transition from an age (the ninth), distinguished by some efforts of intellectual inquisitiveness, into one remarkable for the general prostration of the human understanding. But, on the other hand, we find that, in the eleventh and twelfth ages, the necessity of *secret* confession was more strictly and assiduously inculcated; yet the firmer rivetting of that spiritual chain cannot certainly be attributed to any further access of darkness. In fact, the contrary was the case, since the partial revival of letters is very justly ascribed to that period. But the innovation which we have last mentioned, and to which others might be added, was probably occasioned by the disputes then prevailing between the church and the empire, which made it necessary to extend by every exertion the influence of the clergy over their lay fellow-subjects. Again, the use of indulgences in the place of canonical penance, which grew up in the twelfth age, was one of the earliest and most pernicious creations of the crusades, and wholly independent of the growth and movements of literature. But notwithstanding these and many other points of disconnection, there has ever existed a sort of general correspondence between religion and learning, most especially remarkable in those ages when the ministers of the one could alone give access to the mysteries of the other, and when the only incentive to studious application was religious zeal or ecclesiastical ambition; so that it would be as improper entirely to separate those subjects as it would be impossible, in these pages, to enter very deeply into discussion concerning the ecclesiastical literature of so many ages. We shall

therefore content ourselves by striving from time to time to illustrate this work by such subsidiary lights as shall most obviously present themselves, so far at least as regards the different forms of theological learning, and the methods of theological education. At present, after a very brief review of earlier times, we shall conclude our imperfect inquiries at the end of the eleventh century.

The earliest schools established in the provinces of the Western Empire were of civil foundation, and intended entirely for the purposes of civil education; and so they continued *Early Schools*, until the social system was subverted by the barbarian conquest. This revolution affected the literary in common with all other institutions: in the course of the sixth century profane learning entirely disappeared, together with the means of acquiring it; and before its conclusion, the office of instruction had passed entirely into the hands of the clergy. The municipal schools of the empire gave place to cathedral or episcopal establishments, which were attached, in every diocese, to the residence of the bishop; and throughout the country elementary schools were formed in many of the monasteries, and even in the manses of the parochial priesthood.

The system of education which prevailed in those of Italy, and which was probably very general, is described by the canon* which enjoins it:—‘Let all presbyters who are appointed to parishes, according to the custom so wholesomely established throughout all Italy, receive the younger readers into their houses with them, and feeding them, like good fathers, with spiritual nourishment, labour to instruct them in preparing the Psalms, in industry of holy reading, and in the law of the Lord.’ Such regulations prove, no doubt (if they were really enforced), that the education of the clergy was not entirely neglected: but they prove also, that such education, even in that early age, was confined to the clergy, and that it embraced no subjects of secular erudition. It is true, indeed, that the *names* of rhetoric, dialectics, and the former subjects of civil instruction, were perpetuated in the ecclesiastical seminaries; but those sciences were only taught, as they were connected, or might be brought into connexion, with theology, and made instrumental in the service of the church†.

But even this partial glimmering of knowledge was extinguished by the invasion of the Lombards, and the very genius of Italy seems to have been chilled and contracted by the iron grasp of the seventh century. Rome alone retained any warmth or pulsation of learning; if learning that can be called, which scarcely extended beyond a superficial acquaintance with the canons of the church. And though there exist some monuments, which appear to prove the existence of presbyteral or archipresbyteral schools in the eighth century, we need scarcely hesitate to prolong to the middle of that age the stupefaction of the preceding, and to attribute the first movement of reanimation to the touch of Charlemagne, or his immediate predecessor.

* Concilium Vasense Secundum (529 A.D.) The materials for the following pages are principally taken from the Dissertations (43 and 44) of Muratori, the Hist. Litt. de la France, two Discourses of Fleury, and the 16th Leçon of Guizot.

† The reproach addressed by Gregory the Great to St. Dizier, Bishop of Vienne, is commonly known. That prelate had ventured to deliver lessons on ‘Grammar’ in his cathedral schools: ‘It is not meet (said the pope) that lips consecrated to the praises of God should open to those of Jupiter.’ The extensive meaning then attached to the word *grammar* will be mentioned presently.

While Italy was thus lifeless, some seeds from the plant of knowledge, which had been blown to the western extremity of Europe, took root there, and reached a certain maturity. Accordingly, we find it recorded, that 'two Irishmen, persons incomparably skilled in secular and sacred learning,' had reached the shores of France, and were giving public lectures to the people*. Their fame reached the ears of Charlemagne, who immediately employed them in the education of the youth of Gaul and Italy.

Alcuin, as we have mentioned, enjoyed the honour of affording personal instruction to the emperor and presiding over his Palatine school; and Dungal, another native of Ireland †, has acquired some importance in the history of Italy by the lessons which he delivered in her schools. This eagerness of Charlemagne to avail himself of foreign talent and acquirements evinces his earnestness in the prosecution of his great project, to civilize by the path of knowledge—a project which failed indeed through the perversity of political circumstances and the incapacity of most of his successors; but which, if perseveringly pursued, must generally be successful, because it is in unison with the natural inclinations, and energies, and prospects of the mind of man.

France profited by this conjuncture more rapidly than Italy, as she had not previously fallen quite so low in ignorance: and it would even seem that the schools, which were now instituted in that country, were open to the laity as well as to those intended for the sacred profession, though the office of instruction remained entirely in the hands of the clergy. But it is certain, that very few were found to avail themselves of a privilege of which they knew not the value. Among the numerous names, which adorn the literary annals of France during the ninth century, there are scarcely one or two which are not ecclesiastical. Even Germany outstripped in the race of improvement the languid progress of Italy; and under a sky so splendidly prolific of taste and genius there arose not any one character conspicuous, even in his own day, for intellectual advancement, through a space of more than four centuries ‡. And this extraordinary dearth of merit is not entirely to be charged on the neglect of rulers, whether temporal or spiritual. Italy shared with his other provinces the admirable institutions of Charlemagne and of some of his successors; and there are canons of Roman councils still extant, published in the ninth century §, which directed the suspension of any among the priesthood who should be convicted of ignorance, and provided means for the instruction of the rural clergy ¶. But these measures, though they might possibly secure a mediocrity of theological acquirement, were insufficient to call forth any commanding spirit into the field of literature.

The tenth century did not increase the store of knowledge, nor multiply the candidates for fame either in Italy or France. ¶ In France, the

* Not gratuitously, it would seem, as literary missionaries, but for money contributed by their hearers.

† Scotus: a term which was long confined to the sister island. Muratori condescends to employ some pains to ascertain whether or not Dungal was a monk, as were his two compatriots mentioned in the text—a question deemed of some importance to the honour of the monastic order.

‡ Some may consider Pope Nicholas as an exception; and he certainly possessed great talents, and was not devoid of canonical learning, though in both respects probably much inferior to Hincmar. But his character was essentially ecclesiastical; it was not adorned by any recollection purely literary.

§ In the years 826 and 853.

¶ The decree of Pope Leo IV. is cited by Muratori.

¶ The two leading literary heroes of France during this age were (1.) St. Odo, Abbot

depredations of the Normans during the conclusion of the preceding age, destroyed not only the leisure and security, but even the means and food of study. For in their savage incursions, those unlettered pagans directed their rage against the monasteries, as being the principal seats of letters and religion; the buildings were reparable, but the manuscripts which they contained perished irretrievably. Nor was this the only calamity, nor even the most fatal of the injuries, which obstructed the progress of learning: for it was during the same period that the kingdom of France was broken up into small principalities under independent hereditary vassals, who despoiled the people of the few rights and blessings which they had possessed under a single sceptre, and whose rule permitted the license which their example encouraged. In the prostration of human laws the law divine was easily forgotten, and the hand which was accustomed to robbery did not long refrain from sacrilege. In such wild periods the wealth and the weakness of the Clergy have always pointed them out as the earliest victims*; and this domestic anarchy was probably more effectual in arresting the steps of learning and civilization than the more transient tempests of foreign invasion. We shall here only pause to remark, that during the struggles of this frightful period, the defence of the tower of knowledge, as heretofore its construction, was entrusted by Providence to ecclesiastical hands; while its walls were incessantly menaced or violated by a lawless military aristocracy, which had closely wrapped itself in ignorance, and was partly jealous and partly contemptuous of every exertion to improve and enlighten mankind.

We are not surprised to observe that a condition of civil demoralization, such as then existed, should have been attended by corruption in every rank of the clergy. The Bishops were negligent and immoral, and the inferior orders indulged in still grosser vices and more offensive indecencies†; and we may be well assured that the laity were still further debased by the example of deformities, which their own turbulence had so greatly tended to create.

Comets, and eclipses, and earthquakes were fearful prodigies and sure prognostics of disaster, and the most penetrating astronomers‡ of the day shared (or pretended to share) the common solicitude. Enchantments, auguries, and divinations were ardently sought after, and commanded implicit belief. The forms of trial called 'the Judgments of God,' were of the same description, and scarcely less remote from the precincts of reason; and yet these degrading superstitious, though never canonically received as a part of Church discipline, and even continually combated by the more enlightened ecclesiastics, were both respected and practised among the lower Clergy during this and the three following ages.

of Cluni, who wrote some theological works and a Life of St. Gregory of Tours—he died in 942—and (2.) Frodoard, Canon of Rheims, who composed the History of the Church of Rheims, and a Chronicle, extending from 919 to 966, the year of his death.

* Most of the monasteries which escaped destruction fell into the hands of *lay* Abbots, who used them as residences or castles, or usually as hunting-seats. On the other hand, the foundation of Cluni, in the same age, compensated the loss of many old, and probably corrupt, establishments.

† In the enumeration of these by the truly Catholic compilers of the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, it is mentioned, as not the lightest scandal, that 'there were priests who dared to marry publicly.'

‡ Astrologers, we should rather say. Muratori (*Dissert.* 44) attributes the introduction of these vanities to the study of Arabic literature. But was that study generally in fashion before the time of Pope Sylvester?

Howbeit, even in the dreary records of this century we find traces of parochial schools for the instruction of children of both sexes*; and we read a long list of literary worthies whose names have in many cases survived their works, and whose works were chiefly remarkable for the meanness of their subjects, and the perplexed or puerile manner in which they are treated. And yet even these are sufficient to exhibit to us the spirit of improvement striving against the casual torrents which threatened to wash it away; and though it unquestionably receded during the calamitous interval between the death of Hincmar and the end of the tenth century†, still, if we look somewhat farther back, and confine our attention to the country about which we are best informed, we need not hesitate to pronounce that the literary condition of France was, upon the whole, more prosperous when Sylvester II. ascended the chair, than when Charlemagne mounted the throne of Rome.

As to Italy, the spell which had bound her genius during the preceding centuries seemed to be confirmed and riveted in the tenth. It is true, that some schools were yet found scattered through the towns and villages, which may have raised the character of the clergy somewhat above the degradation of the seventh and eighth centuries, to which the Lombard conquest had reduced it; but the industry of those schools appears still to have been confined to the study of grammar and some necessary knowledge of canonical law; and it is complained that the nobles, who sent their sons to them, had rather in view the episcopal dignities for which they thus became qualified, than the spiritual fruits of religious education. It is very probable that they were attended by none of any class excepting those intended for some branch of the ministry.

These remarks sufficiently explain, to what extremely narrow limits was confined, both in respect to its character and diffusion, the learning of those ages which immediately followed the subversion of the Western Empire. From civil, it had passed under ecclesiastical superintendence; but the Church which undertook the charge was itself corrupted and barbarized by contact with the profound ignorance and rude character and institutions of the conquerors: so that the immortal models were neglected, the precepts of the ancient masters forgotten, and the whole light of literature, properly so called, extinguished. Nevertheless, we are not to suppose that the ecclesiastics of those days offered to their contemporaries no substitute for those treasures which they had not the means or the inclination to dispense. On the contrary, their productions were at some periods extremely abundant in number, and in character far from unprofitable: and on this last point there is one important observation, which it is here proper to make, and which we press the more seriously, because it is not very commonly urged. These writings were almost wholly confined to theological matters, and their object (however faultily it may sometimes have been pursued) was *practical*. Instructions, sermons,

* According to the regulations of that at Toul the children were admissible at seven years of age, and received their first lessons in the Psalms; and it was provided that the boys and girls should be taught separately. The parochial curés appear (as in Italy) to have had the charge of such establishments.

† About this time the establishment of some Greek commonalties took place in Lorraine, introducing a partial knowledge of that language. And these Orientals were there encountered by certain emigrants from Ireland, a country which appears never to have forfeited the affections, nor to have secured the residence, of its sons. 'Nationem Sctorum quibus consuetudo peregrinandi jam pæne in naturam conversa est.' Walafridus Strabus (liv. ii., c. 27, de vita Sancti Galli), apud Murat. Diss. 37.

homilies, interpretations and illustrations of scripture, were published in great profusion, and furnished to the people the only means of intellectual instruction. It is true that they were rude and unskilfully composed; but they were addressed to rude assemblies, and were for the most * part directed to the moral improvement of those who read and heard them; and moreover, their effect to that end, whatsoever it may have been, was at least not counteracted by any other description of literature: the whole mass had one object only, and that, upon the whole, beneficial. Even the 'Lives of the Saints,' and other legends of those days, may have conduced, though by a different and more doubtful path, to the same purpose; for among the swarms of those compositions which were then produced, and of which so many had a tendency to mere superstition, some may be found unquestionably calculated to move the real devotion and amend the moral principles of a barbarous people. Thus was there much even in the effusions of the most illiterate times which must have persuaded, influenced, and profited the generation to which they were addressed; but their action was confined to their own day, to the moment of their delivery; they were not associated with any of the stable wisdom of former ages; nor were they qualified, nor were they indeed intended, to fix the attention of posterity.

Italy had suffered to a certain extent from calamities similar to those which suspended the progress of France, and which were there followed by the same moral degeneracy; but these causes would scarcely have been adequate to so general an extinction, not of learning only, but almost of the curiosity and wish to learn, had they not been powerfully aided by another circumstance, which is less regarded by historians: this was no other than the extreme scarcity and dearth of manuscripts. This misfortune was not entirely, nor even mainly, attributable either to the destruction of monasteries or the indolence of monks: a more general and substantial cause existed in the absolute deficiency of the *material*. The ancients had obtained from the shores of the Nile, through easy and continual intercourse with Alexandria, sufficient supplies of papyrus to satisfy at a slight expense their literary wants; but after the conquest of Egypt by the Saracens, the communication became less frequent and secure, and the fabric of an implement of peace was probably discouraged by the warlike habits of the conquerors. At least it is certain, that about that period the papyrus began to be disused throughout Europe, and that the monuments, which remain of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, are invariably composed of parchment. It was not possible, when the material was so expensive, that manuscripts could multiply very rapidly, or even that the losses occasioned by decay or devastation could be repaired with any facility; and thus the libraries of the cathedrals and monasteries, to which all the treasures of former ages were at this period confided, were gradually impoverished or destroyed. The records of the time abound with complaints of this general penury of books, as well as with facts in proof of it, one of which is the following:—In the year 855, Lupus, of Ferrara, wrote from his abbey, in France, to Pope Bene-

* It is unquestionable that these writings contained a vast deal calculated to mislead, many errors of an absurd and superstitious tendency; but these evils were probably more than counterbalanced, in their immediate effect upon the people, by the expositions of sound doctrine and lessons of practical piety, which are even more abundant. We refer as a fair example, to the passage of St. Eligius, cited at the conclusion of the last chapter.

dict III., praying for the loan of the concluding part of St. Jerome's Commentary on Jeremiah, with the promise that it should be rapidly copied and returned—'for in our regions nothing is to be found later than the Sixth Book, and we pray to recover through you, that which is wanting to our own insignificance.' In addition to this, he ventured to solicit the use of three books of profane writers—the Treatise of Cicero de Oratore, the Institutions of Quintilian, and Donatus's Commentary on Terence.

Muratori considers the zealous Abbot's request as unreasonable and immoderate, and we do not learn whether the Pope consented to grant it; but if the resources of France were really unable to supply him with the books in question, we need not distrust him when he laments the general scarcity of ancient and valuable compositions. This consideration will prevent the disdainful feeling which is almost necessarily roused, when we observe a succession of generations plunged in torpid ignorance, without an effort to extricate themselves from shame, or to let loose the human mind on its natural career of advancement: it disposes us much more nearly to compassion—especially if we reflect how frequently the energy of a vigorous and enterprising soul, secluded in the hermitage or the cloister, must have exhausted itself on the most contemptible subjects, or pined away from the mere dearth of literary sustenance. We shall find little reason to be astonished that genius itself was so seldom able to emerge out of the noisome mist and rise into light and vigour, since its infancy was chilled by prejudices, unexcited by any wholesome exercise, and famished by the positive destitution of intellectual nourishment.

The cause of literary stagnation which we have last mentioned was removed in the eleventh century by the invention of paper,* and accordingly we find that the number of MSS. was greatly multiplied after that time.† But the fury of civil dissension was not mitigated; and under governments at the same time feeble and arbitrary, there was little encouragement for studious application, as indeed there was little honour, or even security, except in the profession of arms. And in sad truth, during the earlier years of this age, the wildest disorders were of such ordinary perpetration, misery had such universal prevalence, and injustice walked abroad so boldly and triumphantly, that there were those who held the persuasion that the millenarian prophecy *had been* already accomplished; that Satan had shaken off his fetters at the one thousandth year, and was actually directing the evil destinies of the human race.

At the same time, let us recollect that great exertions were made by the higher ecclesiastical orders to apply an indirect but very powerful remedy to these excesses, by re-establishing the discipline of the Church. For this purpose, about eighty councils were held in France alone during the eleventh century.‡ We have already related how zealously the authority of

* A very interesting account of the progress of paper-making, writing, printing, &c. may be found in the Life of Caxton published by this Society.

† Still it was in the eleventh age that a Countess of Anjou is recorded to have purchased the Homilies of Haimon, at the price of 200 sheep, besides a very large payment in wheat, barley, skins, and other valuable articles. Hist. Litt. de la France, xi. siècle.

‡ The zeal which was applied in the beginning of this age to the building and restoration of churches, basilicas, monasteries, and other holy edifices, is warmly praised by ecclesiastical writers. 'Erat enim instar ac si mundus ipse excutiendo semet, rejecta vetustate, passim candidarum ecclesiarum vestem indueret—Glabrus Rodolph. apud Du Chesne, Script. Franc., lib. xlv., cap. 4, cited by Muratori.

Rome had engaged itself in the same cause; and by a necessary reaction, the success of every effort for the improvement of morality was favourable to the advancement of literature. The example of Sylvester II. might be sufficient to rouse the jealous emulation of Italy; and Sylvester left to that country not his example only, but the fruits of his active zeal in encouraging the learned of his own time, and in establishing schools and collecting libraries for the use of other generations. Some of the Popes, his successors, followed his traces with more or less earnestness; and among the rest, Gregory VII. added to his extraordinary qualities the undisputed merit of promoting the progress of education*.

The voice of controversy, which was once more heard in this century, not only created another motive for literary activity, but proved the revival of a spirit of inquiry, inconsistent at least with universal ignorance. The talents of Lanfranc†, the earliest boast of reviving Italy, were animated by the 'Heresy' of Berenger; and to the ingenious disputations thus occasioned it is usual to attribute the growth of the new system of theological science, afterwards called Scholastic.

That is a very broad, but in many respects a correct view of early theological literature, which distributes it into three æras.

The *first* of these comprehends the whole list of the ecclesiastical fathers—men who, though they varied exceedingly in character, style, and even opinion, were nevertheless united by one great principle; for they acknowledged no other sources of faith, and revered no other authority, than Scripture and apostolical tradition. On this foundation, they boldly applied to the elucidation of religious subjects such reasoning and eloquence as Nature had bestowed on them: perverted, it might be, by the peculiar prejudices of the times and countries wherein they lived, but little restrained either by the use or abuse of educational discipline, and wholly exempt from servile subjection to the opinions of any predecessor. The characteristics of this age are such as we should expect from such principles—an overflow of piety stained by superstition, exuberance of learning without a proportionate fruit of knowledge, and sallies of oratory, which sometimes ascended into eloquence, and sometimes dwindled away into puerile declamation, or cold and empty allegory. This æra is by many extended down to the eighth century, and considered as properly terminating with John Damascenus; but the concluding half of the fourth age and the beginning of the fifth was the true period of its glory; and thence we may trace the gradual dissolution of its distinguishing qualities into that system which was afterwards established in its place and on its ruins.

The *second* was the æra of intellectual blindness and dependence; its most laborious works were mere collections, quotations, and compilations; as if the minds of that generation were stupified by gazing on

*Three Characters
of theological
Literature.*

* In a council held in 1078, he strongly pressed on all bishops the necessity of superintending education in their respective dioceses.

† 'Lanfrancus teneriorem ætatem in sæcularibus detrivit, sed in Scripturis divinis animo et ævo maturavit.' France was for some time the principal field of his exertions, and Muratori supposes that Hildebrand, attracted by his celebrity, may have visited that country for the purpose of hearing him. The name of Anselm succeeds to that of Lanfranc: that learned prelate was born at Aosta, which then belonged to the Dukes of Burgundy—so that France disputes with Italy the honour of having produced him. He too is considered by Muratori as having prepared the way for the scholastic system of theology.

the brilliant creations of their predecessors, till they mistook them for pure and inimitable perfection. St. Augustin and St. Gregory were the idols of those abject worshippers; and if their piety was sometimes kindled by the enthusiasm of the former, their Catholic zeal and Papal prejudices were more commonly (or at least more manifestly) nourished by the principles of Gregory. The termination of this period is fixed at the middle of the eleventh century; but its character had been partially interrupted by the writers of the ninth, and most especially by John Scotus; and his style and manner, as well as his opinions, were followed and revived by Berenger.

The grand principle of the *third æra* was the exaltation of reason to its proper pre-eminence over the influence of human authority; a true and noble principle as long as reason itself can be restrained to its just province, so as neither to deviate into minute and barren sophistry, nor to break loose into those dark and interminable inquiries which God has closed against it. Unhappily it was not long before it fell into both these errors, which are, indeed, very closely connected. In the establishment and support of the Scholastic theology, it so frequently descended to degrading artifice, and perplexed itself so blindly in the mazes of chicanery, as to make it doubtful whether religious truth was not more disfigured by the minute disceptations which thenceforward prevailed, than by the superstitious extravagance of the first period, or the obsequious ignorance of the second.

We shall possibly recur to this subject hereafter. At present we need only remark, that during the latter half of the eleventh century considerable addition was made both to the copiousness of libraries and the number of schools and of students, as well in Italy as in France*; but the course of study was still generally confined to the two paths denominated the *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*. The first of these embraced grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics; and grammar was defined to be 'the art of writing and speaking well †,' and professed to comprehend the study of several classical as well as sacred writers. The knowledge of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy swelled the pretensions of the *Quadrivium*.

But, in real truth, the productions and language of the Greeks were wholly neglected and unknown. The science of criticism—the art of distinguishing what is graceful in style, and what is *true* in fact—was not cultivated; and both the study and composition of history were still confined to legendary chronicles‡, or to the ill-digested details of contempo-

* Schools of civil law were founded in both those countries in the eleventh century, and acquired some eminence before its conclusion. Physic, of course, had never been entirely neglected; and as we find that by a council held at Rheims, in 1131, monks were forbidden the practice either of law or medicine, we would willingly have hoped that some attention now began to be paid to the education of the laity. But the prohibition only extended to the walls of the monasteries; the practice of those professions is described to have been very lucrative, and for that reason, and through the continued ignorance of the laity, even in the century following (if we are to believe the compilers of the *Hist. Littéraire*), there were scarcely any who professed medicine except clerks and monks; with the addition indeed of certain Jews, who were held the most skilful practitioners.

† *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xii. siècle.

‡ The first Christian chronicler was Gregory of Tours. He was born at Auvergne in 539, and besides many copious narratives of martyrdoms and miracles, he produced an 'Ecclesiastical History of the Franks.' This work, which contains some faint indications of an educated mind, was not surpassed during that century, or the two which followed. The history begins at the death of St. Martin, in 377, and ends at the year 591. It was

rary narrative. Besides which, the sciences professed were for the most part imperfectly understood even by those who pretended to them; and it is moreover admitted that, as the students of those days usually affected to become acquainted with all the subjects placed before them, they generally departed without any profitable knowledge of any of them. The great mass of the people had no education whatsoever. The result was such as must necessarily follow, whenever the possession of any valuable portion of literary acquirement is confined to very few individuals: the possessors employed it to delude as well as to enlighten the people. So that those ages, deeply as they suffered from the scanty provision of useful and liberal knowledge, were scarcely less vitiated through the inequality with which that little was distributed. The small number who had penetrated the mysteries felt too strongly the advantage and the power conferred by exclusive initiation, to desire their more general promulgation. The more numerous class, who from a distant and hasty glimpse had caught some imperfect insight, by communicating their own obscure views and misconceptions, disseminated many fanciful, if not pernicious, errors and absurd notions. So it proved that the lights which were thus faintly transmitted to the body of the people, were not faint only, but sometimes false and deceitful also. And it is a question for the decision of Philosophy, whether plain and downright ignorance, with all its demoralizing consequences, be not a condition of less danger and better hope than one of mistake and delusion.

NOTE ON ST. BERNARD.

The life of St. Bernard connected, within a few years, the pontificate of Gregory VII. with that of Alexander III. Born in 1091, he flourished during one of the rudest periods of papal history; and he died (in 1153,) just before the era commenced of its proudest triumphs, and, perhaps, of its deepest crimes. His actions and his writings throw the best light which now remains upon that period, and even the following short account of them will not be without its use. St. Bernard was a native of Fontaines, in Burgundy, and descended from a noble family. He entered, at the age of twenty-two, into the monastery of Cîteaux, near Dijon; and so early was the display of his zeal and his talents, that only two years afterwards he was appointed to establish a religious colony at Clairvaux*, in the diocese of Langres. It grew with rapidity, and spread its scions with great luxuriance under his superintendence—so that at his decease, at no very advanced age, he was enabled to bequeath to the Church the inestimable treasure of about one hundred and sixty monasteries, founded by his own exertions. As for himself, though it seems clear that the highest ecclesiastical dignities were open, and even offered to him, his humbler ambition was contented to preside over the society which he had first created, and to influence the character of those which had proceeded from it, by counsel, example, and authority.

But the influence of St. Bernard was not confined to his monastic progeny—it displayed itself in all grand ecclesiastical transactions, in France, in Germany, in Italy; from the altars of the church it spread to courts

continued for the fifty following years, in a much inferior style, by one Fredegarius, a Burgundian, and probably a monk.

* Or Clairval—Clara Vallis.

and parliaments. And, as it was founded on reputation, not on dignity; as it stood on no other ground than his wisdom and sanctity; so was it generally exerted for good purposes; and always for purposes which, according to the principles of that age, were accounted good.

On the schism which took place after the death of Honorius II.*, St. Bernard advocated the cause of the legitimate claimant, Innocent II., with great zeal and effect. During eight years of contestation and turbulence he persevered in the struggle. His authority† unquestionably decided the King and the Clergy of France. The King of England‡ at Chartres, the Emperor at Liege, are stated to have listened and yielded to his persuasions. He reconciled Genoa and Pisa to the cause of Innocent. In the latter city a council was held in 1134, in which St. Bernard was the moving and animating spirit. Nevertheless it is obvious, from the genuine piety which pervades so many of his works, that his mind was then most at home when engaged in holy offices and pious meditation. How well soever he might be qualified to preside in the assemblies, and rule the passions, and reconcile the interests of men, it was in the peaceful solitude of Clairvaux that his earthly affections were placed, and it was to the mercy-seat of heaven that his warmest vows and aspirations were addressed. Through these various qualities—through his charitable devotion to the poor; through that earnest piety which tintured his writings with a character sometimes approaching to mysticism; through his imitation of the ancient writers, Augustin and Ambrose; through his zeal for the unity and doctrinal purity of the Church, St. Bernard has acquired and deserved the respectable appellation of the *Last of the Fathers*.

The remaining works of St. Bernard consist of about four hundred and fifty Letters, a great number of Sermons, and some very important Tracts and Treatises. It would not here be possible, nor any where very profitable, to present a mere analysis of so many and so various compositions. A great proportion of the matter is devoted to the ends of piety and charity,—to the exaltation of the soul of man,—and the inculcation of his highest duties. On points of doctrine, the Abbot of Clairvaux was too ardently attached to his Church to venture upon any deviation from the

* In 1130. Innocent II. succeeded, and ruled thirteen years and a half. Eugenius III. was elected 1145, and reigned for eight years.

† The means by which ecclesiastical authority sometimes (and not, perhaps, very uncommonly) attained its ends in those days, are well displayed in the following anecdote of St. Bernard. The Duke of Guienne had expelled the Bishops of Poitiers and Limoges, and refused to restore them, even on the solemn and repeated injunctions of the Pope and his Legate. St. Bernard had exerted his influence for the same purpose, equally in vain. At length, when celebrating, on some particular occasion, the holy sacrifice, after the consecration was finished and the blessing of peace bestowed upon the people, St. Bernard placed the body of the Lord on the plate, and carrying it in his hand, with an inflamed countenance, and eyes sparkling fire, advanced towards the Duke, and uttered these thrilling words:—‘Thus far we have used supplication only, and you have despised us; many servants of God, who were present in this assembly, joined their prayers with ours, and you have disregarded them: behold, this is the Son of God, who is the King and Lord of the Church which you persecute, who now advances towards you;—behold your Judge!—at whose name every knee bends in heaven, in earth, and beneath the earth. Behold the just avenger of crimes, into whose hands that very soul which animates you will some day fall. Will you disdain him also? Will you dare to scorn the Master, as you have scorned his servants?’ This tremendous appeal was successful. The Duke is related to have fallen with his face to the earth when he heard it; the prelates were restored to their sees, and the schism extinguished. See Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*. tom. ix. ch. iv.

‡ Ernardus, *Vita Sancti Bernardi*. Pagi, *Gest. Pontif. Roman. Vit. Innocent II.*

established, or, at least, the tolerated faith. On the important subject of grace, he appears to have followed the opinion of St. Augustin. He considered the freedom of will to be preserved by the voluntary consent which it gives to the operations of grace;—that that consent is indeed brought about by grace, but that being voluntary, and without constraint, it is still free. The necessity of this freedom he argues at great length, as indispensable to any system of retribution*. ‘Where there is necessity there is not liberty; where there is not liberty, neither is there merit, nor, consequently, judgment.’ (*Ubi necessitas, ibi libertas non est; ubi libertas non est, nec meritum, nec per hoc judicium.*) On the other hand, he maintained the indisputable efficacy of grace; and in defining the limits of its operation, and reconciling its overruling influence with the necessary liberty of a responsible agent, he fathomed the depths, and, perhaps, exhausted the resources of human reason.

As Lanfranc had been the champion of the Church against the heresy of Berenger; as the admirable Anselm † had maintained the better reason and sounder doctrine against the dangerous subtleties of Roscellinus ‡; so St. Bernard, in his turn of controversy, was *Peter* confronted with the most ingenious Scholastic of the age, *Abelard*. Peter Abelard. This celebrated doctor was born in Brittany, in 1079; and while St. Bernard was shaping his character and his intellect after the rigid model of Augustin, Abelard was learning a dangerous lesson of laxity in the school of Origen. We shall not trace the various and almost opposite heresies § into which he was betrayed by the obtuse subtlety of his principles; still less shall we investigate the oblique paths by which he reached those conclusions. It may suffice to say, that he was charged with being, at the same time, an Arian, a Nestorian, and a Pelagian, and with as much justice, perhaps, as such charges were usually advanced by the Roman Catholic Church against his refractory children.

The history of the crimes and the misfortunes of Abelard is known to every

* *Excepto sane per omnia originali peccato, quod aliam constat habere rationem—S. Bernardi ‘Tractatus de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio.’*

† Anselm was probably born at Aosta in 1034, and died in 1105; and though he is claimed by the Gallican church as its noblest ornament since the fifth century, his history belongs more properly to our own. He wrote several works: against the ‘Greek Doctrine of the Holy Procession,’—‘On the Trinity and Incarnation,’ against Roscellinus,—‘On the Immaculate Conception,’—‘On the Fall of the Devil,’—‘On Freewill,’—‘On Original Sin,’—‘Necessity,’—‘Predestination,’—on which latter subjects he had drawn at the well of St. Augustin. ‘His obsequies (says the writer in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*) were preceded, attended, and followed by some miracles; but the holy prelate had performed a vast number more during his lifetime.’ His Life, as given in the *Histoire Littéraire*, is an abridgment of that by the Monk Edmen, his pupil and panegyrist.

‡ During the infancy of St. Bernard.

§ The opinions generally attributed to him are, that he considered the doctrine of the Trinity to have been known to certain ancient philosophers, and revealed to them in recompense for their virtues,—that the Son bore the same relation to the Father, as the species does to the genus; as a certain power to power; as materium to materia; as man to animal; as a brazen seal to brass;—that he denied the Atonement, and reasoned against the murder of an innocent being as the means of appeasing God’s anger;—that he consequently denied the Redemption, though he received the Incarnation as the properest method for illuminating the world with divine light and love;—that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, but not from their substance; and that it was the soul of the world;—that it is not the fault, but the penalty, of original sin which we derive from Adam;—that free will, without the help of grace, was sufficient for salvation. In addition to these, and many other imputations, he was also charged before the Council of Soissons (1121) with Tritheism, and, at the same time, with having asserted, that the Father alone was almighty.

one. When the Abbot of Clairvaux, in the course of his official visitation, inspected the nunnery of the Paraclete, he found the establishment well conducted, and he approved of every regulation. Only, in the version of the Lord's prayer there in use, he observed these words,—‘ Give us this day our super-substantial (*ἐπιούσιον*) bread’—and he thought it insufferable that the very prayer which the Deity had deigned to communicate to man for His own service, should be thus senselessly corrupted by the infection of Aristotle. Abelard defended his version; and hence arose the first recorded altercation between those celebrated theologians. The strictures of St. Bernard irritated that vain Scholastic; and as it happened that a large assembly of the Clergy of France was appointed to meet in the city of Sens, on some occasion deemed important *, Abelard challenged his rival to make good, in the presence of that august body, his repeated charges of heresy. St. Bernard would willingly have declined that conflict: he feared the superiority of an experienced polemic;—‘ I was but a youth †, and he a man of war from his youth. Besides, I judged it improper to commit the measures of divine faith, which rested on the foundations of eternal truth, to the petty reasonings of the schools.’ However, the counsel of his friends prevailed; after some hesitation he accepted the challenge, and appeared on the appointed day. .

Louis VII. honoured the assembly with his presence; the nobles of his court, the leading prelates and abbots, and the most learned doctors of the kingdom were there; and the highest expectations were formed, from one end of the realm to the other, by the rumour of this theological monomachy. The two champions were confronted. Bernard arose: ‘ I accuse not this man; let his own works speak against him. Here they are, and these are the propositions extracted from them. Let him say—I wrote them not; or let him condemn them, or let him defend them against my objections.’ The charges were not entirely read through, when Abelard interrupted the recital, and simply interposed his *appeal to the Pope*. The assembly was astonished at his hasty desertion of the field, which he had so lately sought. ‘ Do you fear,’ said St. Bernard, ‘ for your person? You are perfectly secure; you know that nothing is intended against you; you may answer freely, and with the assurance of a patient hearing. Abelard only replied, ‘ I have appealed to the Court of Rome;’ and retired from the assembly. ‘ I know nothing,’ says Milner ‡, ‘ in Bernard’s

* For the translation of the body of some saint into the cathedral church. The assembly took place in 1140.

† The Abbot probably meant a youth *in controversy*,—for as to age, he was then forty-nine, and his adversary only two years older. Milner, whose account of this transaction has great merit, seems to have understood him literally.

‡ Church Hist. Cent. xii. ch. 2. This author is probably nearer to truth in his praise of Bernard, than in his censure of the ‘heretic.’ The reason of Abelard’s sudden appeal to a higher court was, unquestionably, his distrust of that before which he stood: he might doubt its impartiality, or he might certainly have discovered its determined prejudice against him; and that it was, in fact, very provident in him to appeal betimes from its decision is clearly proved by a passage in the Account, which certain Bishops of France addressed to the Pope, of the proceedings at Sens. ‘ As the arguments of the Abbot of Clairvaux... convinced the assembled bishops that the tenets which he opposed were not only false, but heretical, they, *sparing his* (the heretic’s) *person out of deference to the apostolic see*, condemned the opinions.’ *A loco et iudice quem sibi ipse elegerat, sine lesione, sine gravamine, ut suam prolongaret iniquitatem, Sedem Apostolicam appellavit. Episcopi autem, qui propter hoc in unum convenerant, vestræ Reverentiæ deferentes nihil in personam ejus egerunt, sed tantummodo capitula librorum ejus,’ &c. &c.* It is therefore manifest that this appeal saved him from some personal infiction.—This Letter is published among the works of St. Bernard, p. 1560, edit. Lutet. Paris. 1640. After all, it is some

history more decisively descriptive of his character, than his conduct in this whole transaction. By nature sanguine and vehement, by grace and self-knowledge modest and diffident, he seems on this occasion to have united boldness with timidity, and caution with fortitude. It was evidently in the spirit of the purest faith in God, as well as in the most charitable zeal for divine truth, that he came to the contest.*

We shall now proceed to consider St. Bernard in another (if, indeed, it is another) character,—that of a zealous defender of the power and prerogatives of the church; and we shall observe how far the same principle engaged him, on the one hand, in the support of papal authority, and in the extirpation of heresy on the other. We willingly omit all mention of the miracles which are so abundantly ascribed to him, and which, if they are not merely the fabrications of his panegyrists, are equally discreditable to his honesty and his piety. We defer to a future chapter any notice of the very equivocal zeal which urged him to preach a holy war, to proclaim its predestined success with a prophet's authority, and then to excuse the falsification of his promises by a vulgar and contemptible subterfuge. Yet were all these transactions very certain proofs of his attachment to the principles of the Roman Catholic church. Of the same nature were the eulogies which he so warmly lavished, in one of his treatises, upon the newly instituted order of the Templars. But we pass these matters over, and proceed directly to observe the expressions by which he characterised the Bishop of Rome. 'Let us inquire,' says he, in his letter to Pope Eugenius III.*, 'yet more diligently who you are, and what character you support for a season in the Church of God. Who are you?—a mighty priest, the highest pontiff. You are the first among bishops, the heir of the apostles; in primacy Abel, in government Noah, in patriarchate Abraham, in order Melchisedech, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, in judgment Samuel, in power Peter, in unction Christ. You are he to whom the keys have been delivered, to whom the flock has been entrusted. Others, indeed, there are who are doorkeepers of heaven, and pastors of sheep; but you are pre-eminently so, as you are more singularly distinguished by the inheritance of both characters. They have their flocks assigned to them, each one his own; to you the whole are entrusted, as one flock to one shepherd; neither of the sheep only, but of their pastors also; you alone are the pastor of all. Where is my proof of this?—in the Word of God. For to which, I say,—not of bishops, but of apostles,—was the universal flock so positively entrusted? "If thou lovest me, Peter, feed my sheep." . . . Therefore, according to your canons, others are called to a share of the duty, you to a *plenitude of power*. The power of others is restrained by fixed limits; yours is extended even over those who have received power over others. Are you not able, if cause arise, to exclude a bishop from heaven, to *depose him from his dignity*, and even to consign him over to Satan? These your privileges stand unassailable, both through the keys which have been delivered, and the flock which has been confided to you,' &c. Thus the authority of St. Bernard, which was extremely great, both in his own age and those which immediately followed, was exerted to subject the minds of religious men to that spiritual despotism, which was already swollen far beyond its just limits, and was threatening a still wider and more fatal inundation.

satisfaction to record, that Abelard died (in 1142) in quiet obscurity, in the Monastery of Cluni.

* 'De Consideratione,' lib. ii., c. viii.

Among the numerous discourses of St. Bernard, two* were more especially directed against the heretics of the day; and the preacher declares, that he was moved to this design by 'the multitude† of those who were destroying the vine of Christ, by the paucity of its defenders, by the difficulty of its defence.' In the discharge of this office he inveighs against the innovators in the usual terms of theological bitterness; and at the same time charges them with those flagrant violations of morality and decency, which were so commonly imputed to seceders from the church, though they were, in truth, inconsistent with the first principles of civil society. We shall not repeat those charges, nor copy his ardent vituperations; but there is one passage (in the sixty-sixth sermon), which possesses some historical importance, and which exposes besides the principles of the orator. 'In respect to these heretics, they are neither convinced by reasons, for they understand them not; nor corrected by authority, for they do not acknowledge it; nor bent by persuasion, for they are wholly lost. It is indisputable that they prefer death to conversion. Their end is destruction; the last thing which awaits them is the flames. More than once the Catholics have seized some of them, and brought them to trial. Being asked their faith, and having wholly denied, as is their usage, all that was laid against them, they were examined by the *Trial of water* ‡, and found false. And then, since further denial was impossible, as they had been convicted through the water not receiving them, they seized (as the expression is) the bit in their teeth, and began with pitiable boldness, not so much to make confession as profession of their impiety. They proclaimed it for piety; they were ready to suffer death for it; and the spectators were not less ready to inflict the punishment. Thus it came to pass that the populace rushed upon them, and gave the heretics some fresh martyrs to their own perfidy. I approve the zeal, but I do not applaud the deed; because faith is to be the fruit of persuasion, not of force. Nevertheless, it were unquestionably better that they should be restrained by the sword,—the sword of him, I mean, who wears it not without reason,—than be permitted to seduce many others into their error; 'for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.... Some wondered that the offenders went to execution not only with fortitude, but, as it seemed, with joy; but those persons had not observed how great is the power of the devil not only over the bodies, but even over the hearts of men, which have once delivered themselves into his possession.... The constancy of martyrs and the pertinacity of heretics has nothing in common; because that which operates the contempt of death in the one is piety,—in the other, mere hardheartedness.'... Marcus Antoninus, in the insolence of empire and philosophy, insulted by a similar distinction the firmness of those sainted sufferers, to whom the Abbot of Clairvaux addressed, as to heavenly Mediators, his daily and superstitious supplications. And now again, after another long revolution of centuries and of principles, those despised outcasts, whom St. Bernard, in the loftier pride of ecclesiastical infallibility, consigned, with no better spirit, to eternal condemnation, are

* Sermons 'Super Cantica,' lxxv. et lxxvi.

† In other places he acknowledges the same fact. 'Et item de hæresi, quæ clam pæne ubique serpit, apud aliquos sævit palam. Nam parvulos Ecclesiæ passim et publice deglutire festinat.' &c. &c. 'De Consid., lib. iii., c. i.

‡ This was one of the most popular among 'The Judgments of God,

revered by us as victims in a holy cause, the earliest martyrs of the Reformation !

In the same work in which the office and prerogatives of the Pope were so highly exalted, the writer boldly exposed some of the favourite abuses of the system ; and dictated, from his cell at Clairvaux, rules for its better administration, and for the guidance of the autocrat of the church. His instructions were wise, because they were virtuous, and proceeded from a true sense of spiritual duties and dignity. His general exhortations to Eugenius to cast aside the unworthy solicitude respecting secular matters, which at once embarrassed and degraded the Roman see, and to emulate the venerable patriarchs of the ancient church ; to leave to kings and their ministers the jarring courts of earthly justice*, and to content himself with distributing the judgments of heaven—these lessons were conceived in the loftiest mood of ecclesiastical exaltation, and with the justest sense of ecclesiastical policy ; but the venom had already sunk too deep, and the healing admonitions of the reformer failed to arrest for a moment the progress of corruption.

St. Bernard next addressed his censures more particularly to the practice of appeal to Rome, which was then growing into a notorious abuse. After enumerating some of the evils thus occasioned, the delay, the vexation, the positive perversion of all the purposes of justice, ‘How much longer,’ he exclaims, ‘will you shut your ears, whether through patience or inadvertency, against the murmur of the whole earth ? How much longer will you slumber ? How much longer will your attention be closed against this monstrous confusion and abuse ? Appeals are made in defiance of law and equity, of rule and order. No distinction is made in place, or mode, or time, or cause, or person. They are commonly taken up with levity, frequently too with malice ; that terror which ought to fall upon the wicked, is turned against the good ; the honest are summoned by the bad, that they may turn to that which is dishonest ; and they tremble at the sound of your thunder. Bishops are summoned, to prevent them from dissolving unlawful marriages, or from restraining or punishing rapine and theft and sacrilege, and such like crimes. They are summoned, that they may no longer exclude from orders and benefices unworthy and infamous persons. . . . And yet you, who are the minister of God, pretend ignorance, that that, which was intended as a refuge for the oppressed, has become an armoury for the oppressor ; and that the parties who rush to the appeal are not those who have suffered, but those who meditate injustice.’

Another papal corruption, against which St. Bernard inveighed with equal zeal was the abuse of exemptions. ‘I express the concern and lamentations of the churches. They exclaim that they are maimed and dismembered. There are none, or very few, among them which do not either feel or fear this wound : Abbots are removed from the authority of their Bishops, Bishops from that of their Archbishops, Archbishops from that of their Patriarchs and Primates. Is the appearance of this good ? Is the reality justifiable ? If you prove the plenitude of your power by the frequency of its exercise, haply you have no such plenitude of justice.

* Quænam tibi major videtur et potestas et dignitas ; dimittendi peccata, an prædia dividendi ? Sed non est comparatio. Habent hæc infima et terrena iudices suos et reges et principes terræ. Quid fines alios invaditis ? Quid falce vestram in alienam messem extenditis ? Non quia indigni vos ; sed quia indignum vobis talibus insistere, quippe potioribus occupatis. De Consid., lib. i., c. vi.

You hold your office, that you may preserve to all their respective gradations and orders in honour and dignity, not to grudge and curtail them.' . . . If the virtuous Abbot was moved to such boldness of rebuke by the delinquencies of the eleventh century—the earliest and perhaps the most venial excesses of pontifical usurpation—with what eyes had he beheld the court of Innocent IV., or the chancery of John XXII.! with what a tempest of indignation had he visited the enormities of later and still more degenerate days—jubilees and reservations, annates and tenths and expectative graces—the long and sordid list of Mammon's machinations! The halls of Constance and Basle would have rung with his lamentation and his wrath, and both Gerson* and Julian would have shrunk before the manifestation of a spirit greater far than themselves.

But the inquisition of St. Bernard was not confined to the courts of the Vatican. It penetrated into the dwelling-places and into the bosoms of prelates and of monks. 'Oh, ambition, thou cross of those who court thee! How is it that thou tormentest all, and yet art loved by all? There is no strife more bitter, no inquietude more painful than thine, and yet is there nothing more splendid than thy doings among wretched mortals! I ask, is it devotion which now wears out the apostolical threshold, or is it ambition? Does not the pontifical palace, throughout the long day, resound with *that* voice? Does not the whole machine of laws and canons work for its profit? Does not the whole rapacity of Italy gape with insatiable greediness for its spoils? Which is there among your own spiritual† studies that has not been interrupted, for rather broken off, by it? How often has that restless and disturbing evil blighted your holy and fruitful leisure! It is in vain that the oppressed make their appeal to you, while it is through you that ambition strives to hold dominion in the church.' . . . In another place§—'The unsavoury contagion creeps through the whole church, and the wider it spreads the more hopeless is the remedy; the more deeply it penetrates, the more fatal is the disease. . . . They are ministers of Christ, and they are servants of Anti-Christ. They walk abroad honoured by the blessings of the Lord; and they return the Lord no honour: thence is that meretricious splendour everywhere visible—the vestments of actors—the parade of kings: thence the gold on their reins, their saddles, and their spurs, for their spurs (calcaria) shine brighter than their altars (altaria): thence their tables splendid with dishes and cups; thence their gluttony and drunkenness—the harp, the lyre, and the pipe, larders stored with provision, and cellars overflowing with wine . . . For such rewards as these men wish to become, and do become, rectors of churches, deans, archdeacons, bishops, archbishops—for these dignities are not bestowed on merit, but on the thing which walks in darkness.' . . . A considerable portion of another composition|| is devoted to the exposure of monastic dege-

* John Gerson was a great admirer of St. Bernard. He frequently cited his authority, and composed one discourse expressly in his honour. We always watch with anxiety, and record with respect, the expressions in which one great man has celebrated the excellence of another. But in Gerson's 'Sermo de Sancto Bernardo' we can discover little but fanciful and mystical rhapsody.

† Annon quæstibus ejus tota legum Canonumque disciplina insudat?

‡ This passage is from the 'Third Book of the Consideratio.' It is addressed, we should recollect, to Pope Eugenius, who had been educated in the monastery of Clairvaux.

§ 'Super Cantica Ser. xxxiii.

|| Ad Guillelmum Abbat. Apologia—An Apology to William, Abbot of St. Thierry. The pretext for this Apology was, to defend himself and his own reformed order of Cistercians from the charge of calumniating the rival order, their more opulent brethren, of

neracy. 'It is truly asserted and believed that the holy fathers instituted that life, and that they softened the rigour of the rule in respect to weaker brethren, to the end that more might be saved therein. But I cannot bring myself to believe that they either prescribed or permitted such a crowd of vanities and superfluities, as I now see in very many monasteries. It is a wonder to me whence this intemperance, which I observe among monks in their feasting and revels, in their vestures and couches, in their cavalcades and the construction of their edifices, can have grown into a practice so inveterate, that where these luxuries are attended with the most exquisite and voluptuous prodigality, *there* the order is said to be best preserved, there religion is held to be most studiously cultivated. . . For behold ! frugality is deemed avarice ; sobriety is called austerity ; silence is considered as moroseness. On the other hand, laxity is termed discretion ; profusion, liberality ; loquacity, affability ; loud laughter, pleasantness ; delicacy and sumptuousness in raiment and horses, taste ; a superfluous change of linen, cleanliness ; and then, when we assist each other in these practices, it is called charity. This is a charity indeed which destroys all charity ; it is a discretion which confounds all discretion ; it is a compassion full of cruelty, since it so serves the body, as mortally to stab the soul.' . . Again—'What proof or indication of humility is this, to march forth with such a pomp and cavalcade, to be thronged by such an obsequious train of long-haired attendants, so that the escort of one abbot would suffice for two bishops ? I vow that I have seen an abbot with a suite of sixty horsemen and more*. To see them pass by, you would not take them for fathers of monasteries, but for lords of castles ; not for directors of souls, but for princes of provinces.' . . St. Bernard then proceeds to censure the show of wealth which is exhibited *within* the monasteries†, and subsequently exposes the secret motive of such display. 'Treasures are drawn towards treasures ; money attracts money, and it happens that where most wealth is seen, there most is offered. When the relics are covered with gold, the eyes are struck, and the pockets opened. The beautified form of some Saint is pointed out, and the richer its colours the greater is deemed its sanctity. Men run to salute it—they are invited to give, and they admire what is splendid more than they reverence what is holy. To this end circular ornaments are placed in the churches, more like wheels than crowns, and set with gems which rival the surrounding lights. We behold inventions like trees erected in place of candlesticks, with great expense of metal and ingenuity, also shining with brilliants as gaily as with the lights.

Cluni. St. Bernard did not lose that opportunity of generally inveighing against monastic abuses.

* 'Mentior,' says the holy abbot, 'si non vidi abbatem sexaginta equos et eo amplius in suo ducere comitatu. Ducas, si videas eos transeuntes, non patres esse monasteriorum, sed dominos castellorum ; non rectores animarum, sed principes provinciarum.'

† 'Omitto Oratorium immensas altitudines, immoderatas longitudes, supervacuas latitudes, sumptuosas depolitiones, curiosas depictiones, quæ dum orantium in se detorquent aspectum impediunt et affectum, et mihi quodammodo representant antiquum ritum Judæorum. Sed esto—fiant hæc ad honorem Dei. Illud autem interrogo monachos monachos, quod in gentilibus gentilis arguebat—

Dicite, Pontifices, in sancto quid facit aurum ?

Ego autem dico, Dicite *Pauperes* ! Non enim attendo versum sed sensum—Dicite, inquam, pauperes, si tamen pauperes, in Saucto quid facit aurum ?'—Loc. Citat. It seems probable that St. Bernard, in the interval of his theological labours, had studied the Roman Satirists with pleasure, and not without advantage.

they hold. Say, whether of the two is the object in these fabrications—to awake the penitent to compunction, or the gazer to admiration? Oh vanity of vanities, and as insane as it is vain! The church is resplendent in its walls, it is destitute in its poor. It clothes its stones with gold—it leaves its children naked. The eyes of the rich are ministered to, at the expense of the indigent. The curious find wherewithal to be delighted—the starving do not find wherewith to allay their starvation.*

Such was the Abbot of Clairvaux; in profession and habits a monk—in ecclesiastical polity at once a reformer and a bigot—in piety a Christian. His single example (if every page in history did not furnish others) would suffice to show that a very great preponderance of excellence is consistent with many pernicious errors; and that innumerable ensamples of purity and holiness have flourished in every age, as they doubtless still flourish, in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. Because many Popes were ambitious and many prelates profligate, it would be monstrous to suspect that righteousness was nowhere to be found in that communion; it would be unreasonable to suppose that the great moral qualities, which distinguished St. Bernard, were not very common among the obscurer members and ministers of his church. His genius, indeed, was peculiarly his own. The principles which least became him were derived from his church and his age; but his charity and his godliness flowed from his religion, and thus they found sympathy among many, respect and admiration among all. These were the crown of his reputation; and while they fortified and exalted his genius, they also gave it that commanding authority which, without them, it could never have acquired. From this alliance of noble qualities St. Bernard possessed a much more extensive influence than any ecclesiastic of his time—more, perhaps, than any individual through the mere force of personal character has at any time possessed; nor is it hard to understand, if we duly consider the imperfect civilization of that superstitious age, that monarchs, and nobles, and nations should have respectfully listened to the decisions of a monk, who gave laws from his cloister in Burgundy to the Universal Church.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Pontificate of Innocent III.

[From 1198 to 1216.]

Prefatory facts and observations—Circumstances under which Innocent ascended the chair—Collection of Canons—Condition of the clergy—Ecclesiastical jurisdiction—by what means extended—Innocent's four leading objects—(1.) To establish and enlarge his temporal power in the city and ecclesiastical states. Office of the Prefect—Favourable circumstance, of which Innocent avails himself—his work completed by Nicholas IV.—(2.) To establish the universal pre-eminence of papal over royal authority. His claims to the Empire—His dispute with Philippe Auguste of France—he places the kingdom under interdict—submission of Philippe—His general assertions of supremacy—particular applications of them—to England and France, Navarre, Wallachia and Bulgaria, Arragon and Armenia—His contest with John of England—Interdict—the Legate Pandolph—Humiliation of the King—(3.) To extend his authority within the church. Italian clergy in England—his general success in influencing the priesthood—Power of the Episcopal Order—The fourth Lateran Council. Canons on transubstantiation—on private confession—against all

* ‘O vanitas vanitatum, sed non vanior quam insanior. Fulget ecclesia in parietibus, et in pauperibus eget. Suos lapides induit auro et suos filios nudos deserit. De sumptibus egenorum servitur oculis divitum. Inveniunt curiosi quo delectentur, et non inveniunt miseri quo sustententur.’

heretics—(4.) To extinguish heresy. The Petrobrusians—their author and tenets. Various other sects, how related. The Cathari—supposition of Mosheim and Gibbon—the more probable opinion—The Waldenses—their history and character—error of Mosheim—Peter Waldus—his persecution. The Albigens or Albigenses—their residence and opinions—attacked by Innocent—St. Dominic—title of Inquisitor—Raymond of Toulouse—holy war preached against them—Simon de Montfort—resistance and massacre of the heretics—Continued persecution of the Albigens—Death of Innocent—Remarks on his policy.

DURING the period of one hundred and thirteen years, which intervened between Gregory VII. and Innocent III., the progress of ecclesiastical power and influence was very considerable; and the latter ascended the pontifical chair unembarrassed by many of the difficulties which impeded the enterprises of the former. The principal causes of that progress may be traced, perhaps, in a few sentences. In the first place, new facilities to learning had been opened during the twelfth century, of which the clergy had availed themselves very generally, and which the laity had as generally neglected. It is true that the kind of learning then in fashion possessed, for the most part, no substantial or permanent value; still it was a weapon as powerful, perhaps, for the government of the ignorant, as if its polish had been brighter, or its edge more keen; and, as its real inefficiency was unknown, it equally answered the end of exciting a blind respect for those who had the exclusive use of it. In the next place, the discipline of the church had undergone an important reformation, the honour of which we are bound to ascribe to the vigorous exertions of Gregory, imitated, with more advantage perhaps, by feebler successors. Three Lateran Councils (the first General Councils of the Western Church) were held during the twelfth century; and the second and third of these, assembled respectively in 1139 and 1179, by Innocent II. and Alexander III., more particularly directed their attention to the extirpation of ecclesiastical abuses, to the confirmation of ancient canons, and the introduction of such others as might amend the discipline and consolidate the interests of the church. This object was materially advanced by the labour of a monk of Bologna, named Gratian, who published, in 1151, his celebrated *Collection of Canon Laws**. And this branch of study, thus facilitated, received further encouragement from Eugenius III., who instituted the degrees of Bachelor, Licentiate, and Doctor in that science. By the advance of learning among the sacred profession, by the greater precision and more general knowledge of the canons of the church, and by the rigour with which they were frequently enforced, the morals of every rank of the clergy were essentially improved. The two notorious scandals of the former age, concubinage and simony, if not effectually removed, were at least restrained within more decent limits; and the extreme licence, in some other respects, which had prevailed for at least two centuries before Gregory VII., was checked and repressed. So that Innocent was called to the command of a more enlightened, a more orderly, a more moral, and therefore a more influential priesthood.

It may be true, as Mosheim asserts, that the revenues of the Pope had received no considerable augmentation between the ninth century and the time of Innocent; but those of the clergy, *Ecclesiastical property*, and especially of the monastic orders, had been swelled during the same period by the most abundant contributions. Indeed, in most countries the territorial domains of the church

* The accidental discovery of the Pandects of Justinian, in 1137, may have furnished to Gratian the notion, as it certainly supplied the model, of his work.

were at that time spread so widely, as almost to justify the complaint that they comprehended half the surface of Europe; nor should we omit to mention that the clergy, though in some kingdoms liable to annual donatives, and to arbitrary plunder in all, were still legally exempt from taxation, and from every regular contribution to the service of the state. From such immunity, though it was occasionally violated, and the violation usually attended with outrage, they must, nevertheless, have reaped great advantage, and especially in peaceful periods. But such partial profits have always a drawback in the jealousy which the distinction occasions, and which exposes those who enjoy it to the distrust and dislike of their fellow-subjects.

We have already observed how extensive, and, at the same time, how indefinite, were the rights of jurisdiction, which were partly conferred on the church and partly confirmed to *Ecclesiastical jurisdiction.* it by Charlemagne,—rights, which were scarcely less important to the general influence of the clergy, than their learning or their revenues. During the tumults of the three following centuries, they were transgressed or exceeded as the civil or ecclesiastical portion of the state happened in any country to preponderate; but they appear to have sustained no permanent alteration, either in abridgment or increase, until the beginning of the twelfth century. About that time the ecclesiastical tribunals commenced a system of encroachment, which made great progress even before the pontificate of Innocent, and was carried by that Pope and his successors to still greater excess, and seemed to threaten the entire subversion of the secular courts*. It was the first step in this usurpation to multiply the number of *persons* subject to the jurisdiction of the church; the next, to extend almost without limit the *offences* of which it took cognizance. The first of these objects was accomplished by the indiscriminate Tonsure, which we have before mentioned to have been so generally given by the bishops. This sign of the clerical state did not indicate ordination or any spiritual office; but it conferred the use of the ecclesiastical habit, and with it the various privileges and immunities enjoyed by that order, without the restraint of celibacy†, to which it was liable. This very numerous class, though for the most part engaged in secular professions and occupations, was subject to no other than the episcopal tribunals‡; and we may remark, that all the moveable property of this body fell under the same jurisdiction§.

Another very large class, under the denomination of ‘*miserabiles personæ*’ (persons in distress), was also exclusively subjected to the episcopal courts. It comprehended, even in the first instance, a multitude of the lowest orders; and it was presently so enlarged as to include orphans and widows, the stranger and the poor, the pilgrim and the leper||. Again;

* Tirate tutte le cause d’ appellatione in Roma, si procurò d’ ampliare la giurisdizione del Foro Episcopale, e stendere la conoscenza de’ Giudici Ecclesiastici sopra più persone ed in più cause, sicchè poco rimanesse a’ magistrati secolari d’ impicciarsene. Giannone, Ist. di Napoli, lib. xix., c. v., sect. iii.

† In this respect, those persons were placed in the condition of the priests of the Greek church: they were allowed to marry once only, and a virgin.

‡ In the kingdom of Naples, under the dynasty of Anjou, this matter afterwards went so far (says Giannone), that even the *concubines* of the clergy enjoyed immunity from secular jurisdiction.

§ In conseguenza di quella massima mal intesa, *mobilia sequuntur personam*.—Giann. loc. cit.

|| We refer to the seventh chapter of Mr. Hallam’s *Middle Ages*. It is a bold and, in most respects, an accurate disquisition on papal history.

the opportunity offered by the Crusades was not neglected in the progress of usurpation; and in this case the arm of ecclesiastical justice extended itself not only over all who engaged in the expedition, but over those too who had bound themselves by the vow.

A great facility was also afforded for enlarging the boundaries of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by the want of definiteness in the nature of the offences subject to it. These were designated by one name, *spiritual*; but it is clear that, in an ignorant age, that term might be so extended by an artful priesthood as to embrace every sin and almost every crime; since there are no sins* and few crimes which do not indicate some disease of the soul, and touch its eternal safety.

The general term, under which ecclesiastics contrived to comprise the greatest number of causes, was *Bad Faith*; as being unquestionably a sin, yet such, that an action could seldom occur, in which both parties were clear from the suspicion of it. Thus they claimed for their tribunals all trials on executions of contracts, because the contract was founded on oath. They also claimed to be natural interpreters and executors of all wills and testaments, as being matters peculiarly connected with the *conscience*; and thus they gradually extended the spiritual net over the entire field of civil litigation†. But they forgot that that which properly belonged to them was censure, not jurisdiction; or they affected artfully to confound the office of penal chastisement with that of penitential correction. The encroachments of the church were aided by the negligence, as they were almost justified by the incompetence, of the lay tribunals; and they had already made considerable advances, with little apparent opposition, and acquired extensive conquests in the domains of secular jurisdiction, at the time when Innocent III. took possession of the pontifical chair.

From the above circumstances, we have reason to presume that in actual authority, not less than in moral influence, the church had

* ‘*Si peccaverit frater tuus, dic Ecclesiæ.*’ This seems to have been the *text* on which ecclesiastical jurisdiction was mainly founded. It had a much better foundation in the superior intelligence and moral principles of ecclesiastics.

† Having once interfered in the matter of wills, the bishops proceeded in some countries to arrogate the power of making wills for the laity, *ad pias causas*; and the interests of the church were advanced by that piety. Some were found who even claimed the property of all intestate persons. Again, when the interests of a clerk were involved in connexion with those of laymen, the decision was claimed by the Ecclesiastical Court. So also, when the cause was very difficult in point of reason, in case of the incompetence, negligence, or suspiciousness of the lay judge, the matter was referred to the Episcopal Tribunal. So likewise, under the name of *forum mixtum*, it claimed its share in all cases of bigamy, usury, sacrilege, adultery, incest, concubinage, blasphemy, sortilege, perjury, as in those of tithes and pious legacies. So in all causes arising from marriage, as being a Sacrament of the church. And lastly, there were some Roman doctors who maintained that every condemned person in every country should be sent to Rome for punishment; seeing that Rome was the common country and metropolis of all men, that the world was Roman, and all its inhabitants citizens and subjects of Rome.—Giannone, *loc. cit.* The following lines were intended to comprehend the jurisdiction of the spiritual court:—

Hæreticus, Simon, fœnus, perjurus, adulter,
Pax, privilegium, violentus, sacrilegusque;
Si vacat Imperium; si negligit, ambigit, aut sit
Suspectus iudex; sit subdita terra, vel usus,
Rusticus et servus, peregrinus, feuda, viator.
Si quis pœniteat, miser! omnis causaeque mista—
Si denunciat Ecclesiæ quis, judicat ipsa.

We shall take a future opportunity of recurring to the subject of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

acquired growth and strength since the era of Gregory VII.; and that the sacred militia, whom Innocent was appointed to command, and by whose aid he meditated and almost accomplished the destruction of the temporal authorities, then exerted a much more powerful control over every department of society, than it had ever possessed at any former period.

We shall obtain a more distinct knowledge of the designs and success of that celebrated pope, if we examine separately the principal points to which his exertions were directed, than we could gain by a chronological narrative of his pontificate. According to such a distribution, we may properly consider these objects to have been four; not, indeed, that they were thus minutely analysed in the mind of Innocent, or that his daring schemes subject to any such classification: but the historian who contemplates great transactions after an interval of many centuries, and a change in many principles, is bound to consider particular actions as parts of the whole mighty drama, in the respect they bear to the circumstances of the actors, and the character of the age. Thus it is, that in studying the actions of Innocent III., our observation is necessarily most directed to the following points:—

I. To establish the temporal power of the Holy See in the city of Rome, and in the ecclesiastical states; and to enlarge their boundaries. II. To fix the pre-eminence of the papal over the royal authority, throughout all the kingdoms of the west, and to reduce all princes to the condition of vassalage to the Pope; which was, indeed, merely a continuation of the scheme of Gregory. III. To enlarge the pontifical authority and influence within the church. IV. and lastly, To secure the unity of the faith by the extirpation of heresy. All these were at that time becoming essential parts of the papal polity; and almost all the important acts of Innocent may be traced to some one of them.

I. As the policy of the Holy See becomes more and more entangled in temporal transactions, as we observe the spiritual majesty of the apostolical chair gradually degenerating into the *Court of Rome*, it is fit that we employ a few sentences on the character of the people which was subject to its immediate sway; partly because we shall thus discover what

sort of instruments for their secular designs the Popes possessed at home, and partly that we may learn, whether the great moral blessings were more abundantly diffused among the subjects of an ecclesiastical monarchy. For this purpose we shall select two very well known authorities, the one from the tenth, the other from the thirteenth century, only premising that, though the particular facts which they convey may be highly coloured, the general consent of history confirms the substance. Luitprand*, who was sent as legate from Otho the First to the Eastern Emperor, expressed in

this language the sort of reputation then possessed by the Roman people:—‘We Lombards despise them so deeply, that for our very enemies, when most moved against them, we can find no designation more contumelious, than

Roman. In this single term, I mean Roman, we intend to comprehend all that is base, all that is cowardly, all that is avaricious, all that is luxurious, all that is false and lying—aye, every vice that has a name.’ The

* See Luitpr., Legatie, apud Muratori Script. Ital. vol. ii.; also Dissertat. 40 ejusd. auct.

evidence of St. Bernard on the same subject is more particular, and scarcely more honourable to the descendants of the Gracchi:—‘Why should I mention the people? the people is Roman. I have no shorter, nor have I any clearer term to express my opinion of your parishioners (parœcians.) For what is so notorious to all men and ages as the wantonness and haughtiness of the Romans? A race unaccustomed to peace, habituated to tumult—a race merciless and intractable, and to this instant scorning all subjection, when it has any means of resistance. . . . Whom will you find, even in the vast extent of your city, who would have you for Pope, unless for profit, or the hope of profit*? And it is then most that they seek to rule, when they profess to serve. They promise fidelity, to have the better means of injuring those who trust them. . . . They are men too proud to obey, too ignorant to rule, faithless to superiors, insupportable to inferiors; shameless in asking, insolent in refusing; importunate to obtain favours, restless while obtaining them, ungrateful when they have obtained them; grandiloquous and inefficient; most profuse in promise, most niggardly in performance; the smoothest flatterers, the most venomous detractors,’ &c. ‘Among such as these you are proceeding as their pastor, covered with gold and every vanity of splendour. What are your sheep looking for? . . . If I dared to use the expression, I should say, that it is a pasture of demons rather than of sheep.’ . . .

Many of the features in this revolting picture are common to the courts of every climate and religion—to the sycophants of every race and age. The exclusive appropriation of meanness and treachery—the monopoly of human baseness—could not truly be ascribed even to the people of Rome. But there is one among the vices imputed to them which was indeed their characteristic—restless and turbulent insubordination. Shall we consider this defect as the corruption of an ancient virtue? Certainly even a cursory review of the government (if government it can be called) under which the imperial city had struggled for above four centuries, will show that the vice, whether indigenous or not, received much encouragement and excuse from extraneous circumstances. We have already mentioned the doubtful limits of the authority respectively exercised by the Patrician and the Bishop under the Greek emperors. When that rule finally passed away, Charlemagne (and before him Pepin) assumed the temporal administration of Rome under the same name, Patrician; and during his reign the imperial supremacy was in practice felt, as it was undisputed in right. Weaker princes, and ages almost of anarchy succeeded. Nevertheless, the supreme dominion of the emperors, which

* Eugenius III. The passage in the *De Consideratione*, lib. iv. Cap. ii. We have purposely omitted some parts of it in the text, the following for instance:—‘*Et nunc experire paucis noverimne et ego aliquatenus mores gentis. Ante omnia sapientes sunt, ut faciant mala, bonum autem facere nesciunt. Hi invisi terre et celo utrique injecere manus, impii in Deum, temerarii in sancta, seditiosi in invicem (qu. judicem?) amuli in vicinis, inhumani in extraneos; quos neminem amantes amat nemo. Et cum timeri affectant ab omnibus, omnes timeant necesse est. Hi sunt qui subesse non sustinent,’ &c. . . . Ita omne humile probro ducitur inter Palatinos, ut facilius, qui esse quam qui apparere humilis velit, invenias. Timor Domini simplicitas vocatur, ne dicam fatuitas,’ &c. . . . These Palatines seem to have been the eminent Ecclesiastics resident at the Holy See. The cardinals, who formed the nucleus of the future court of Rome, though now gradually rising in dignity, were not yet, probably, in possession of any corporate prerogatives. We shall only add one more testimony, that of John of Salisbury, the contemporary and countryman of Adrian IV., against the Roman clergy:—‘*Provinciarum diripiunt spolia, ac si thesauros Croci studeant reparare. Sed recte cum iis egit Altissimus, quoniam et ipsi alii et sæpe vilissimis hominibus dati sint in direptionem.*’ . . .*

may have been partially suspended, was re-established by Otho; 'their title and image were engraven on the Papal coins, and their jurisdiction was marked by the sword of justice which they delivered to the *Prefect* of the city*.'

On the other hand, the residence of the Emperor was remote, and the communication slow and precarious. Once only, in the course perhaps of a long reign, he presented himself to his Roman subjects. The purpose of that visit was to receive his crown from the pontifical hand, and the ceremony was usually attended with tumult and bloodshed. Again—at that coronation he thrice repeated the royal oath, to maintain the liberties of Rome. The ancient fable, too, was continually inculcated, and perhaps universally believed, that Constantine had consigned the temporal sceptre to the hand of the Bishop. And in those ages of superstitious darkness, the prejudices of mankind saw nothing incongruous in the double character of a sacerdotal monarch. These circumstances were on both sides unfavourable to the welfare of Rome, for while they neutralized, and almost destroyed the power of the *Prefect*, they gave no substantial foundation to that of the Pope. So that in the uncertainty thus created, as to where the civil executive authority really was placed, the people were left without any efficient control. Their inclination would naturally lead them to respect most the power, which was more nearly and immediately exercised. But the short reigns of most of the Popes; the tumultuous scenes which commonly disgraced their election, and which were prolonged so obstinately whenever there was a rival for the chair; the very circumstance, that the choice of a ruler was influenced by the rabble—all conspired to lower his dignity, and to lessen the efficacy of his temporal authority. It is true, that during the latter half of the twelfth century, after the constitution of Alexander III. (in 1179), these evils were in some degree abated. Still there were no principles of stability in the civil administration; and it is scarcely too much to assert that, from the time of Charlemagne to that of Innocent, the pontifical city had never once felt either the restraint or the blessing of a strong government.

The regulation of Alexander III. was an omen of greater improvements. But a change of more importance in the civil history of Rome was the establishment of the Senate; and this is referred, as a permanent act, to the year 1144. In the meantime, the dignity of 'Prefect of the City' had gradually declined to a municipal office, filled from the families of the native nobility. Even the name was, for a short time, abolished, and succeeded by that of *Patrician*, though it was speedily restored, together with the original ensigns of power. But at length Innocent III. broke off the last link of the imperial power. He rejected at the same time its ancient emblem; and while he absolved the *Prefect* from all dependence of oaths or service on the German Emperors, he removed the sword from his hand, and substituted a peaceful *banner* in its place.

But the tranquillity of Rome was not secured by its independence; and other changes succeeded, in the difficult attempt at self-government by a people educated almost in anarchy. In the first instance, the name and authority of the Senate was condensed in the office of a single magistrate—the *Senator*; and soon afterwards in that of two colleagues. The most jealous precautions† were taken to secure their integrity, or, at least, their

* See Gibbon's 69th chapter.

† According to the laws of Rome (in the fifteenth century), the Senator was required to be a Doctor of Laws, an alien, of some place at least forty miles distant, and unconnected,

harmlessness. But they were still Romans; and the turbulence of the subjects seems to have been rivalled by the rapacity of the rulers. Another scheme, which had been elsewhere successful, was then applied to the disorders of Rome. In the dearth of native virtue, or at least in the despair of domestic disinterestedness and impartiality, she called to the helm of state a foreign governor. It was about the year 1250, that Brancalcione of Bologna was chosen Senator; and, in the progress of seventy-eight years, the same office was filled and dignified by Charles of Anjou (about 1265), by Pope Martin IV. (in 1281), and lastly, by Lewis of Bavaria; 'and thus (says Gibbon) both the sovereigns of Rome acknowledged her liberty by accepting a municipal office in the government of their own metropolis.' A government susceptible of such strange anomalies could not hope for peace or permanence. Even the secession of the Popes to Avignon did not emancipate Rome from their occasional sway, and their ceaseless persecution. And thus the people were doubly sufferers—they suffered, when subject, from the weakness of an absent sceptre—they suffered, when independent, from the perpetual struggles which were made to reduce them. After seventy years of foreign residence, the Pontiffs returned to their legitimate abode. But the schism, which immediately followed the restoration, still further enfeebled a grasp already trembling with the weight of the temporal sword. That inveterate turbulence, transmitted through so many ages, continued for some generations longer; and it was not until the middle of the fifteenth century, that the pontifical city became permanently subject to pontifical government.

From this short anticipation of some future events, we return to observe the working of that powerful hand, which influenced so deeply the destinies of the Church, and which influenced them almost wholly for evil—and in no one respect more so, than when it constructed the temporal fabric for the support of a power essentially spiritual, and waved before those brilliant portals the dark bloodstained edge of the material sword. Possibly the powerful mind of Innocent was seduced into those projects by the inviting circumstances of the moment. During his entire pontificate the situation of the empire was extremely favourable to any hostile schemes. The legitimate sovereign (afterwards Frederic II.) was a minor, and the sceptre was for some time disputed by two princes (Philip and Otho IV.), to each of whom the patronage of the Pontiff was equally important. At a later period, after the death of Philip, the dissension was renewed, in another form, but with the same character, between Otho and Frederic; and the latter of these rivals now became as anxious to cultivate the friendship of the Pope, as heretofore the former. Innocent availed himself of these advantages to enrich and fortify the Church at the expense of all those disputants, or at least of the empire which they disputed. Accordingly, one of the earliest acts of his reign was to disarm the Prefect of all authority derived from abroad, and thus to erase the last remaining vestige of German domination. Again, the extensive donation of territory which the Princess Matilda had made to the Roman see, during the administration of Gregory VII., had been unceasingly contested by the empire; and the greater force had generally constituted the better right.

to the third canonical degree, with any Roman inhabitant. The election was annual; the departure from office was attended with a severe scrutiny; nor could the same person be re-elected until after two years. The salary was 3000 florins. Gibbon, c. 70.

Innocent, towards the end of his pontificate, was enabled so far to profit by the weakness of Frederic, as to obtain from that prince a formal confirmation of the grant; at the same time, a considerable territorial cession, made to the see by the Count of Fundi, received the same ratification. It is proper, indeed, to ascribe the completion of this work to Nicholas IV., who ruled about seventy years afterwards. That Pope reduced under his dominion some cities, which had hitherto owned a nominal allegiance to the Emperor; and extended the states of the Church to those nearly which are their present boundaries. But to Nicholas no higher celebrity is due, than that he pursued with success the policy which had descended to him from his predecessors, and which had received its first impulse from Innocent; for, until his pontificate, the temporalities of the see, notwithstanding the successive donations (pretended* or real) of Constantine, and Pepin, and Charlemagne, and Lewis the Meek, and even Matilda, formed, in fact, if not a mere field for incessant contention, at best a very precarious and unprofitable possession.

II. *On the Usurpations of Papal over Royal Authority.*—In respect to this part of the pontifical system, we have already seen that the equivocal glory of creating it is not due to Innocent; he received it from former (perhaps from better) ages, among the established duties of the apostolical office. It was sealed by the consent of many venerable Pontiffs; by the authority of Gregory VII. It was congenial to the unconverted pride of the human heart—that passion, which burnt most fiercely in the breast of Innocent, and which the waters of the gospel were seldom invited to allay. His was indeed the character formed, under whatsoever ordination of Providence, to fill up the outlines so daringly traced, and to pursue the scheme which his great predecessor had bequeathed to him. The same circumstances which forwarded his other temporal projects were, as far as they extended, favourable to this. Once more he drew his strength from the divisions of the empire. He deposed Philip—Philip denied his right—but it was willingly acknowledged by the rival Otho, who did not scruple to accept (in 1209) the diadem from the pontifical hand. Only three years afterwards the Pope pronounced, in the same plenitude of power, the same sentence of anathema and deposition against Otho. With what justice could Otho dispute the power by which he had deigned to rise? The vacant throne was then conferred upon Frederic.

A purely spiritual despotism can rest on no other ground than popular prejudice—commands which have no visible power to enforce them will only be obeyed through a general predisposition to believe, that they proceed from some still superior authority. The monarch would have derided the sentence of deposition, had it not found attention and respect among his subjects. That it should ever have acquired such general respect may indeed seem strange, and the causes which were then sufficient for that end could only have operated in a very blind and ignorant age. For instance, the mere ceremony of coronation by the Pope, to which the Emperors, in imitation of Charlemagne, had almost invariably submitted, would seem to afford no trifling pretext for the claims of the former; since it was in those days an easy inference that the crown, which for many gene-

* Sismondi (Repub. Ital. c. iii.) remarks that 'as the act of Pepin's donation is lost, we know not on what conditions it may have been made.' He also expresses a reasonable doubt, whether this donation, though nominally confirmed by Charlemagne and Lewis, was ever effectuated.

rations had been habitually received from the hand of the Pope, could not legally be worn except through such presentation; and then it followed, since there were many who zealously inculcated the consequence, that the gift conferred was in fact the *property* of the donor*, who again had power to recall his gift, and present it to some worthier candidate. At the same time we should never lose sight of that *general* veneration for the throne of St. Peter, which at that period especially overspread the prostrate nations, and overawed the reason of man; for it was, in truth, not an uncommon belief that the blessed Apostle invisibly presided over the altar of his martyrdom, and guarded and sanctified with mysterious majesty the chair of his successors.

The eagerness with which the emperors generally courted the ceremony of coronation, though it was attended by circumstances very humiliating to their pride, certainly proves that there existed among their subjects a strong feeling as to its propriety, perhaps its necessity. But that which gave the greatest colour to the extreme pretensions of the See, was the readiness with which princes acknowledged them, when they found their profit in the acknowledgment. The very edicts which they rejected with scorn when addressed to themselves, they embraced and effectuated when levelled against a rival. The right, as a general right, was never contested. The partial interests of the moment overpowered every consideration of a broader policy; and thus amid the ever-reviving jealousies and dissensions of monarchs and pretenders, the consistent perseverance of the Vatican established the most groundless claims, and accomplished the most extravagant purposes. Of course the agents for the dissemination of its principles and the instruments of its success were the ecclesiastical orders, and especially the monks; and the very general union and co-operation which at this time prevailed (more perhaps than at any other period, more certainly than at any later period) between the Pope, the clergy, and the monasteries, facilitated the execution of Innocent's boldest designs.

The first interference of that pontiff in the affairs of the French court was defended by precedents, and occasioned by an offence at all times peculiarly liable to spiritual jurisdiction. *Contest with Philippe Auguste* having espoused a Danish princess, *Philippe Auguste* named Ingelburg, or Isenburg, hastened on the very day following the nuptials to divorce her. He pretended to have discovered that they were connected by too near a degree of affinity; and after some investigation, at which two legates and Pope Celestine assisted, the marriage was declared null. Innocent, probably considering that concession as extorted from the timidity of his predecessor, lost no time in setting aside the divorce, and commanding the king to take back his bride. He refused, and an interdict was immediately thrown on the whole kingdom. The public offices of worship were suspended; even the doors of the churches were closed; the Sacrament of Christ was no longer administered†, and the rites of marriage and sepulture remained unperformed. We

* This inference required, of course, a large share of zeal in the teacher and docility in the disciple. The Patriarch of Constantinople had possessed from the earliest ages the office of crowning the Greek emperor, without ever dreaming that he acquired any sort of interest in the crown itself by the performance of an ordinary ceremony. But ecclesiastical matters were very differently conducted in the west.

† We should mention, that even under the oppression of the severest interdict, the sacraments of Baptism, Confession, and Extreme Unction still continued to be administered. But it was attended by other prohibitions, not strictly of a religious nature, calculated to inspire gloom and fanaticism. The hair, for instance, and the beard were to be left

should here recollect, that with the mass of an ignorant people professing a corrupt form of faith, the public exercise of religion constituted, in fact, its entire substance. Deprived of that, they had no refuge in private prayer, or the consolations of internal devotion. To such persons the sentence of an interdict must have fallen like an immediate edict of rejection and separation from heaven; and such in the twelfth century was the multitude of every class. Philippe Auguste was a prince of uncommon resolution and address. Nevertheless he found it expedient to bend before the tempest, and obey the pontifical mandate.

This was the earliest triumph of Innocent, and it encouraged his ambition to attempt more daring achievements. At least he did not long confine it to objects which offered any particular justification, but advanced on the broadest ground of universal interference. In a bull published in 1197, he declared, 'that it was not fit that any man should be invested with authority, who did not serve and obey the Holy See.' At another time he proclaimed, 'that he would not endure the least contempt of himself, or of God, whose place he held on earth, but would punish every disobedience without delay, and convince the whole world that he was determined to act like a sovereign.' 'As the sun and the moon are placed in the firmament, the greater as the light of the day and the lesser of the night, so are there two powers in the church, the pontifical, which, as having the charge of souls, is the greater; and the royal, which is the lesser, and to which only the bodies of men are trusted.*' 'Though I cannot judge of a fief†,' said Innocent to the kings of France and England, 'yet it is my province to judge when sin is committed, and my duty to prevent all public scandals.' This was indeed the loftiest and the most respectable ground on which the Papal pretensions could be placed; and if the Bishops of Rome had really been contented with the exercise of a beneficial authority—if they had employed the mighty power with which they found themselves invested, *only* for the reconciliation of enmities, for the concord, the morality, the most obvious interests of the human race, then, indeed, we might have forgotten the origin of that power in its blessed uses, and pardoned to the Vicar of Christ his presumptuous appellation, when we saw him engaged in doing the works of Christ, and consoling his children upon earth.

However, the interference, even of Innocent III., was not always for evil. On the strength of his delegated authority he dictated a truce to Philippe and Richard, and after some difficulties obliged both parties to submit to it. It was about the same time that he directed one of his legates to compel the observance of peace between the Kings of Castille

unshaven; the use of meat was forbidden; and even the ordinary salutation was prohibited. But the suspension of sepulture, the exposure of the corpses to dogs or birds, or even their promiscuous interment in unhallowed ground, was probably in practice the most appalling part of the sentence. From the learned treatise, '*De l'Origine et du Progrès des Interdits Ecclésiastiques*,' by Pierre Pithou, it appears that there were *indications* of such an exercise of ecclesiastical power in very early ages; though it was not applied to any grand purpose, as a pontifical implement, until the time of Hildebrand.

* Innocent's famous *Rescript* to the emperor of Constantinople (in which the above allegory is produced) respected chiefly the immunity of clerks; and as it was founded on the maxims published by Gratian, which were themselves founded on the False Decretals, so itself became in process of time a new Decretal, the groundwork, if necessary, of other still more inordinate pretensions. It was thus that the system grew.

† The general cognizance of causes relating to fiefs had escaped, as it would seem, ecclesiastical usurpation.

and Portugal, if necessary, by excommunication and interdict. He moreover enjoined the King of Arragon to restore to its intrinsic value the coin which he had lately debased, thereby oppressing and defrauding his subjects. The mere wanton display of power may *not* have been his motive—some generous considerations may sometimes have influenced him. ‘A great mind (says Hallam), such as Innocent III. undoubtedly possessed, though prone to sacrifice every other object to ambition, can never be indifferent to the beauty of social order and the happiness of mankind.’

Not contented to influence the most vigorous monarchs of the most powerful kingdoms of the age, he descended to issue his edicts to inferior princes. He sent forth instructions to the King of Navarre respecting the restoration of certain castles to Richard. He distributed the insignia of royalty to Briscislaus, Duke of Bohemia, and to the Dukes of Wallachia and Bulgaria. He conferred the crown of Arragon on Peter II. as his subject and tributary. And finally (that no race or clime might seem inaccessible to his arm), he gave a king to the Armenian nation, dwelling on the border of the Caspian Sea.

Yet, with all this extent of despotic sway, it was in England that his boldest pretensions were advanced, and advanced with the most surprising success. The circumstances are known to all *With John of* readers. In the year 1199, Richard I. was succeeded on *England.* the throne by John, the feeblest of the human race; and that prince was presently assailed by an outrage from the Holy See, which disturbed for some years the repose and allegiance of his subjects, and the stability of his throne. On the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, the monks in chapter publicly elected to that dignity John, Bishop of Norwich, who was recommended and confirmed by the King. At the same time they chose, at a private meeting, Reginald, their own sub-prior*, and sent him to Rome for institution. When this matter was referred to Innocent, he immediately reversed both elections, and nominated Stephen Langton, a Roman cardinal, of English descent. The chapter listened to the spiritual, in preference to the temporal, tyrant; and the monks were in consequence expelled from their residence, and their property was confiscated. The Pope proceeded with no less energy to enforce his asserted rights, and commanded the Bishops of London, Worcester, and Ely, to lay the whole kingdom under an interdict. There were some prelates, however, and several inferior ecclesiastics, who hesitated to enforce this edict; and since John made no concession, Innocent issued, in the following year (1201), a bull of excommunication against the name and person of the sovereign. This sentence, still ineffectual, was followed, in 1211, by another yet more appalling. The subjects of John were absolved from their allegiance, and commanded to avoid his presence. Yet as even this measure was insufficient for his entire success, he had then recourse to the last and most dangerous among the bolts of the Vatican. He pronounced the final sentence of deposition; and having declared the vacancy of the throne, gave force to his words by conferring it upon Philippe Auguste of France. At the same time he ordered that monarch to execute the sentence.

Philippe's obedience was secured by his ambition; he was joined by the exiles of his rival's tyranny; and to ensure his success, or, more probably,

* Pagi Brev. Pont. Rom. Vit. Innoc. III. Sect. 49.;

to complete the consternation of John, Innocent proclaimed a crusade against the English king as against an infidel or a heretic. The armies were assembled on both sides, and hostilities were on the point of commencing, when Pandulph, the legate of the Pope, presented himself at the camp at Dover. He there displayed the final demands of the Pope, and the King had courage to resist no longer. The demands to which he submitted were these,—that he should resign his crown to the legate, and receive it again as a present from the Holy See ; that he should declare his dominions tributary to the same See ; and that he should do homage and swear fealty to Innocent, as a vassal and a feudatory. The shame of this humiliation was increased by the ceremony attending it ; by the multitude of sorrowful or indignant witnesses ; by the very *manner* * in which the haughty legate bore himself on his triumph. Yet, to the eye of an earnest and fervent Papist, is the degradation of England's monarch, while he stood waiting, amid his nobles and his soldiers, to accept his crown from the suspended hand of Pandulph—is it, after all, a spectacle of such lofty exultation—is it a picture so flattering to his spiritual, even to his ecclesiastical, pride—as the half-naked form of the imperial penitent of older days, shivering, with his scanty train of attendants, before the castle gates of Gregory ?

III. *The Increase of Pontifical Authority within the Church.*—The description of John's humiliation, and of the steps which led to it, connects the second with the third part of this inquiry—for, in the first place, it shows the extent to which Innocent carried his claims to patronage within the Church ; and in the next, it exhibits one motive of the general anxiety evinced by the see to extend that internal influence. The Interdict, which was now become the favourite instrument of papal usurpation, however formidable in name and deed, was an empty denunciation, unless enforced by the personal exertions of the Bishops, and even of the inferior clergy of the kingdom subjected to it—as we, indeed, observed, that in England the sentence of Innocent failed of its full effect, through the opposition of a part of the clergy. And thus, in any project of temporal aggrandizement which a Pope might undertake, success could never be secured unless he could command the co-operation of the very great proportion of the ecclesiastical body. It was partly for this reason that so many foreign, and especially Italian, prelates were placed, for many ages, in English sees. In Germany, too, Innocent showed the same anxiety to extend his right of appointment ; by a formal capitulation with Otho IV. he obtained that of decision in disputed cases ; and it is obvious to what easy abuse it was liable. In other countries he advanced the same claim, which had been so fatally disputed in England, with less resistance and equal success. His example was imitated by following Pontiffs : and the facility thus acquired, of exciting rebellion amongst a restless nobility and a superstitious people, against a weak and arbitrary government, terrified the boldest monarchs, and frequently led them to sacrifice the future security of the crown to the hopes or apprehensions of the moment.

On the other hand, the very great progress made by Innocent in extending the papal influence among the priesthood, *The Saladin tax.* was counteracted by a measure which may have been necessitated by other causes, but which cer-

* Among other circumstances it is related, that Pandulph did actually keep the crown in his possession for some minutes. The annual tribute stipulated was 1000 marks.

tainly was ill calculated to increase the attachment of that body. Not contented to exact from them very considerable occasional contributions, he imposed a regular tax on ecclesiastical property, and he was the first Pope who ventured upon that measure. It was called the Saladin tax; and it is true that the service of *religion*,—whether in Languedoc or in Palestine, for the murder of Saracens or of heretic Christians,—was alike the pretext, and in part the motive, for those exactions. Nevertheless, they were advanced with reluctance; and the innovation was the less tolerable, as it would certainly become a precedent for future and more oppressive extortions.

It is also necessary to observe, that the collective power of the episcopal order was not so great at that time as it had been in the ninth or tenth, or even in the earlier part of the eleventh century, owing to the gradual disuse of those national synods which, in former ages, controlled the conduct of kings. But we should at the same time remark, that the authority thus lost by the hierarchy was not gained by the sovereign. It changed owners, indeed, but it did not pass out of the possession of the church. It was merely transferred from one part of that body to another; from the members to the head; from the prelacy to the Pope: and by him it was exercised with a reckless audacity, an unity of design, and a consistent perseverance, which could not possibly have directed a long series of local and dependent councils. So that the change in the constitution of the church, by which it became less aristocratical, (if we may so apply that term,) and more despotic, though it considerably altered the relative positions of the crown and the mitre, did not at all increase the preponderance of the former; on the contrary, the greater concentration of ecclesiastical authority in one instead of many hands, made it a more dangerous rival to the civil government. The advance of pontifical power was very closely connected with the improvement of discipline, and the progress of that system of uniformity, which was designed entirely to pervade and bind together the *Universal Church*.

Among the most important acts of Innocent's pontificate was the convocation of the fourth Lateran Council,—the most numerous and most celebrated of the ancient assemblies *The fourth Lateran Council*. This august body consisted of nearly five hundred* archbishops and bishops, besides a much greater multitude of abbots and priors, and delegates of absent prelates, and ambassadors from most of the Christian courts of the west and of the east. It met together in the November of 1215, for the proffered consideration of two grand objects. The first was the recovery of the Holy Land; the second was the Reformation of the church in faith and in discipline. Seventy canons were then dictated by Innocent, and received its obsequious confirmation. It does not appear that its deliberations (if they may so be called) were attended with any freedom of debate; and within a month† from the day of its opening, having executed its appointed office, it was dismissed.

Among the articles on that occasion enacted, there were several wisely constructed for the welfare of the Roman Catholic church: they amplified the body of the canon law, and regulated in many respects the practice

* The numbers are, of course, variously stated; that of the archbishops at seventy-one or seventy-seven, that of the bishops generally at four hundred and twelve, that of the abbots and priors at eight hundred.

† This fact alone proves that the canons in question were not made matter of discussion with that numerous assembly.

of ecclesiastical procedures, which is followed to this day. But as we cannot in this work pursue such a variety of matter into its detail, we shall select only those which were the most important in substance or in consequence.

If any doubt hitherto remained in the orthodox church respecting the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ were *Transubstantiation*. present at the Eucharist, it was on this occasion removed by Innocent, who unequivocally established, or rather confirmed*, that which is now, and which had then been for some time, the doctrine of Roman Catholics. Moreover, as he well knew the efficacy of a *name* to propagate and perpetuate a dogma, and also that he might have a fixed verbal test whereby to try the opinions and obviate the evasions of heretics, he invented and stamped upon that tenet the name of 'Transubstantiation.'

Another canon (the twenty-first) strictly enjoined to all the faithful of both sexes, to make, at least once in the year, a private confession of their sins, and that to their own priest or curate; and to fulfil the penance which he might impose on them. They were at the same time prohibited from confessing to any other priest, without the special permission of their own†. They were also directed, under severe ecclesiastical penalties in case of neglect, to receive the Eucharist at Easter, unless a particular dispensation should be granted them, also by their own priest. By this regulation, the system of auricular confession was indeed carried to very refined perfection; and there is no reason to doubt that a canon, which imparted even to the lowest of the priesthood such close and searching influence over the conscience and conduct of a superstitious generation, was speedily brought into universal operation. That in some instances, that on very many *particular* occasions, the effect of this influence has been beneficial to society; that sinful dispositions have been frequently repressed and crimes prevented by the present and immediate control of a pious minister, is not merely probable, but indisputable. But as a *system* of morality, that could not possibly be creative of righteous principles which held out, through bodily penance, a periodical absolution from sin,—even if the hands which administered it were always pure. But when we consider the abuse to which such a power is necessarily liable, and how greatly, too, it would increase through the abuse, we cannot fail to perceive that it was a machine too powerful to be entrusted to the necessary infirmity, to the possible caprice or wickedness, of man.

By the proposed reformation in the faith of the Church, nothing was in fact meant, except the extirpation of heresy, and this *Extinction of heresy*. was the first object presented to the attention of the council. After a formal exposition of faith, upon those points especially on which the existing errors were sup-

* Mosheim is probably wrong in supposing that full liberty had hitherto been left to pious persons to interpret the doctrine according to their own reason. The sense of the church was sufficiently expressed by the councils which were held against Berenger; or had it not been so, at least the Council of Piacenza confirmed the doctrine explicitly declared on former occasions. It only remained to Innocent to ascertain and consolidate the doctrine by the term.

† The sacrament was taken immediately after confession. 'This is the first canon, as far as I know,' says Fleury, 'which imposes the general obligation of sacramental confession. There was then a particular reason for it, on account of the errors of the Vaudois and Albigeois touching the sacrament of penance.' At the Council of Toulouse, in 1228, the confession and sacrament were enjoined *thrice* in the year; but this again was in the very focus of heresy.

posed to have arisen, the Pope and the Prelates immediately proceeded (in the third canon) to anathematize every heresy. As soon as they are condemned (says the Council), they shall be abandoned to the secular power, to receive the suitable punishment. The goods of laymen shall be confiscated; those of clerks applied to the uses of their respective churches. Those who shall only be suspected of heresy, if they do not clear themselves by sufficient justification, shall be excommunicated. If they remain a year under the suspicion, they shall be treated as heretics. The secular powers shall be advised, and, if need be, constrained by censures, to make public oath that they will exile all heretics marked out by the Church. If the temporal lord, on admonition, shall neglect to free his territories from their pollution, he shall be excommunicated by the Metropolitan and the other Bishops of the province; and if he should not submit within a year, the Pope shall be informed; to the end that he may pronounce his vassals absolved from the oath of fidelity, and expose his domain to the conquest of the Catholics. These, after having expelled the heretics, shall peaceably possess and preserve it in doctrinal purity—saving the right of the liege lord, provided he offer no obstacle to the execution of this decree. . . . It is remarkable that this decree, which placed secular authorities directly at the disposal of the spiritual, and on the penalty, not of spiritual censures only, but of subjugation and military possession, was enacted in the presence, and with the consent, of the ambassadors of several sovereigns. But this subject has already led us to the last division of the chapter, into which we shall properly enter with a general inquiry as to the forms which heresy assumed in that age, and the measures which Innocent actually adopted for its extinction.

IV. *On the Extirpation of Heresy.*—Since the termination of the controversy concerning images, nearly four hundred years had elapsed, during which the Church had been very rarely disturbed by doctrinal dissension; and amid the various vices which may have stained, in so long a space, her principles and her discipline, she was at least free from the blackest of all her crimes, since her hands were free from blood. The eucharistical opinion of Johannes Scotus, as it had been nourished by the partial brightness of the ninth century, and overshadowed, but not oppressed, by the stupid indifference of the tenth, so, when revived by Berenger, it disappeared in the superstition of the eleventh, without violence or outrage. Not, perhaps, because the ecclesiastics of that age were tolerant or temperate, but rather, because its advocates were not sufficiently numerous or formidable to make a general persecution necessary for its suppression. But in the dawning light of the twelfth age some new heresies were called into life, and others, which had previously lain hid, were discovered and exposed: so that the attention of men was more generally turned to the subject, and the rulers of the Church were roused from their long and harmless repose. Since it was even thus early that several of the Protestant opinions were publicly professed, and expiated by death; and since these may be traced, under a variety of forms and names, but with the same identifying character, from the beginning of the twelfth century to the Reformation; it is proper to notice the first obscure vestiges which they have left in history. In so doing, we shall first describe those sects which were founded (in the West at least) at that time; we shall then proceed to the mention of the Vaudois, to whom a still earlier existence is, with great probability, ascribed.

About the year 1110, a preacher, named *Pierre de Bruijs*, began to declaim against the corruptions of the Church, and the vices of its ministers. The principal field of his exertions was the south of France, Provence and Languedoc, and he continued, for about twenty years, to disseminate his opinions with success, and, what may seem more strange, with impunity. Those opinions may probably have contained much that was erroneous; but they are known to us only through the representations of his adversaries. In a Letter or Treatise, composed against his followers (thence called Petrobrussians), by the Venerable Abbot of Cluni *, they are charged with a variety of offences, which the writer reduces under five heads—(1.) The rejection of infant baptism. (2.) The contempt of churches and altars, as unnecessary for the service of a spiritual and omnipresent Being. (3.) The destruction of crucifixes, on the same principle, as instruments of superstition. (4.) The disparagement of the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist, in asserting that the body and blood was not really consecrated by the priests. (5.) Disbelief in the efficacy of the oblations, prayers, and good works of the living for the salvation of the dead. These errors, howsoever various in magnitude, are controverted with equal warmth by Peter the Abbot; but that which appears to have been most dangerous to the heretic, was the third; at least we learn, that in the year 1180, the Catholic inhabitants of St. Giles's in Languedoc were roused by their priests to holy indignation against *that* sacrilege; and consigned the offender to those flames, which his own hand had so frequently fed with the images of Christ. He was burnt alive in a popular tumult; and this may possibly be the suffering to which St. Bernard, in a passage already cited, has made allusion. But the errors were not thus easily consumed; the list, on the contrary, was enlarged by many additional notions, proceeding, some from the piety, others from the ignorance, of his followers.

One of these †, named Henry, an Italian by birth, obtained a place in the contemporary records, and gave an appellation [*The Henricians*.] to a sect, from him called Henricians. This enthusiast traversed the south of France, from Lausanne to Bourdeaux, preceded by two disciples, who carried, like himself, long staves, surmounted with crosses, and were habited as Penitents. His stature was lofty, his eyes rolling and restless; his powerful voice, his rapid and uneasy gait, his naked feet and neglected apparel, attracted an attention, which was fixed by the fame of his learning and his sanctity. These qualities gave additional force to his eloquence; and as it was not uncommonly directed against the unpopular vices of the clergy, he gained many proselytes, and excited some commotions. Eugenius III. sent forth, for the suppression of this evil, a legate named Alberic; but it appears that his mission would have been attended with but little success; had he not prevailed on St. Bernard to share with him the labour and the glory of the enterprise. Henry was then in the domain of Alfonso,

* Petri Venerabilis, Lib. contra Petrobrussianos, in Biblioth. Cluniensi.

† Henry is generally described as a disciple and fellow-labourer of Pierre de Bruijs. The objection to this opinion, urged by Mosheim, is, that Henry was preceded in his expeditions by the figure of the cross, whereas Pierre consigned all crucifixes to the flames. Without supposing that the objection of Pierre might be to the image of the Saviour, not to the form of the cross, the objection is far from conclusive. Some account of the heresies of the twelfth century is given by Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth. 12 Siecle*, c. vi.

Count of St. Giles and Toulouse; and St. Bernard wrote * to prepare that prince for his arrival, and to signify his motives. 'The churches (he said) are without people; the people without priests; the priests without honour; and Christians without Christ. The churches are no longer conceived holy, nor the sacraments sacred, nor are the festivals any more celebrated. Men die in their sins—souls are hurried away to the terrible tribunal—without penitence or communion; baptism is refused to infants, who are thus precluded from salvation.' He added many reproaches against Henry, whom he accused of being an apostate monk, a mendicant, a hypocrite, and a debauchee. The biographers of that Saint relate, that he was received, even in the most contaminated provinces, like an angel from heaven; and at Albi, the place most fatally infected, an immense multitude assembled to hear his preaching. The day which he skilfully selected for their conversion, was that of St. Peter. He examined in succession the various peculiarities of their belief, and showed their deviation from the Catholic faith. He then required the people to tell him which of the two they would have. The people immediately declared their horror of heresy, and their joy at the prospect of returning to the bosom of the Church. 'Return, then, to the Church (replied St. Bernard); and that we may the better distinguish those who are sincere, let all true penitents lift up their hands.' They obeyed this injunction with one consent: and though St. Bernard, in the course of a leisurely journey from Clairvaux to Albi, had performed many extraordinary miracles, 'this (as the simple Chronicler reports) was the mightiest of all.' Henry himself appears to have fled to Toulouse, whither the eager Abbot pursued him. Thence he once more escaped, and once more St. Bernard followed, purifying the places infected by that pestilence. At length the fugitive was seized and convicted at Rheims, before Eugenius in person, and consigned to prison (in 1148), where he presently afterwards died.

About the same time it would appear that certain other sects, differing in some less important points among themselves, but united in a sort of desultory opposition to the Roman Church, had gained footing, not in France only, but in Flanders, in Germany, and even in the north of Italy. Without any formal separation from the Church, or an entire disregard of its public offices, they had their own ministers, both Bishops and Priests †, to whom they paid a more observant deference, and whom they affirmed to be the only legitimate descendants from the apostles. The opposition of these heretics seems to have been more particularly directed against the wealth and temporal power of the Catholic clergy—but at the same time they rejected infant baptism, the intercession of saints, purgatory—and pro-

* Epistol. 240. (Lutet. Paris. 1640.) It begins, '*Quanta audivimus et cognovimus mala que in ecclesiis Dei fecit et facit quotidie Henricus hæreticus! Versatur in terra vestra sub vestimentis ovium lupus rapax.*' &c.

† Milner, Cent. xii. c. iii., cites the following passage from Evervinus's Letter to St. Bernard, preserved by Mabillon, and written about 1140:—'There have been lately some heretics discovered among us, near Cologne, though several have with satisfaction returned again to the Church. One of their Bishops, and his companions, openly opposed us at the assembly of the clergy and laity, in the presence of the Archbishop, and many of the nobility, defending the heresies by the words of Christ and the apostles. Finding that they made no impression, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, on which they might bring their teachers to a conference, promising to return to the Church, provided they found their masters unable to answer the arguments of their opponents; but that, otherwise, they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this declaration, having been admonished to repent for three days, they were seized by the people in the excess of zeal, and burnt to death. And what is amazing, they came to the stake, and bare the pain, not only with patience, but even with joy.'

fessed, in fact, to receive only those truths which were positively delivered by Christ or his apostles. They are described to have been extremely ignorant, and confined to the lowest classes. But it is at least certain, that in the principality of Toulouse, the nobility had engaged with some obstinacy in the heresy of the Paulicians—less through error than through design, and a malicious satisfaction in the humiliation of the clergy. But the same motives are not less likely to have operated, wheresoever the same or similar opinions were promulgated.

Another religious faction had at that time considerable prevalence, which, under the various names of Cathari (or Catharists—Puritans), Gazari, Paterini, Paulicians or Publicans, Bulgari or Bugari*, was more particularly charged with Manichæan opinions. The origin of these heretics has been the subject of much controversy; for while some suppose their errors to have been indigenous in Europe, there are others who derive them in a direct line from the heart of Asia. It is certain that a very powerful sect named Paulicians, and tainted, though they might affect to disclaim it, with the absurdities of Manes, spread very widely throughout the Greek provinces of Asia during the eighth century. It is equally true, that after a merciless persecution of about one hundred and fifty years, their remnant, still numerous, was permitted to settle in Bulgaria and Thrace. Thence, as is believed by Muratori, Mosheim, and Gibbon, they gradually migrated towards the West; at first, as occasions of war, or commerce, or mendicity (another name for pilgrimage) might be presented; and, latterly, in the returning ranks of the crusaders. It is asserted, that their first migration was into Italy; that so early as the middle of the eleventh century, many of their colonies were established in Sicily, in Lombardy, Insubria, and principally at Milan; that others led a wandering life in France, Germany, and other countries; and that they everywhere attracted, by their pious looks and austere demeanour, the admiration and respect of the multitude. It is moreover maintained, that these widely scattered congregations were organized in united obedience to a Primate, who resided on the confines of Bulgaria and Dalmatia. In confirmation of the authorities on which these opinions rest, it should be observed, that among the various forms of heresy which were detected by the keen eyes of the early Inquisitors, there was scarcely one which escaped the charge of Manichæism†.

Admitting, then, that this charge was very commonly invented for the purpose of making the others more detestable, we cannot question that it was sometimes founded in truth. And while, on the one hand, we are far removed from an opinion, that would refer the origin of all the earliest Western sects to the emigrants from the East—that would consider, not only the Cathari, but the Petrobrussians, Henricians, and even the Vau-
dois themselves, as descendants from the family of Manes—it is equally

* About the middle of the thirteenth century, the Emperor Frederic II. enumerated all the forms, or rather names, of heresy then most scandalous, in the opening of an edict published against them. It begins as follows:—‘Catharos, Patarenos, Speromistas, Leonistas, Arnaldistas, Circumcisos, Passaginos, Josephinos, Garatenses, Albanenses, Franciscos, Beghardos, Commissos, Valdenses, Romanolos, Communellos, Varinos, Ortulenos, cum illis de Aquâ Nigrâ, et omnes hæreticos . . . damnamus,’ &c. See Limborch. Hist. Inquisit. lib. i. c. 12.

† The first canon of Innocent’s Lateran Council distinctly states the church doctrine respecting the Unity of the Deity, in opposition to that of the Two Principles—a sufficient declaration, that many Manichæans were believed to be found among the heretics.

unreasonable to contend, that his wild opinions had no existence in the West of Europe; or even to dispute their perpetuation through parties of Paulicians, who, from time to time, may have migrated into Sicily or Italy. It is indeed unquestionable, that such was the case; and it is not impossible, that they may have formed, even after their dispersion throughout Europe, a distinct and characteristic sect. But it would be absurd to ascribe to their influence the formation of sects, of which the leading principles were wholly distinct, if not entirely at variance, with those of the Asiatics. Even in the dawn of returning knowledge, the faintest glimmerings of reason were sufficient to light the mind to the detection of papal delinquency, of the aberrations of the Church and its ministers. It required not a star from the East to indicate, even in those dark times, how distinct were the principles of the Church from the precepts of the Gospel; or to contrast the deformities of the Clergy with the purity of their heavenly Master. Such incongruities obtrude themselves perhaps the most forcibly upon illiterate minds, and excite the deepest disgust in the simplest conscience. It is to this cause, that the heresies of those early ages may most confidently be traced—they may indeed have been infected, in a greater or less degree, with some of the notions of the Paulician colonists—but that assuredly was not the source from which they flowed.

As we have been careful to distinguish the Catharists, who may have been semi-Manichæan, from the other sects of reformers who were scattered throughout Europe, so we *The Vaudois*. must again consider the Vaudois or Waldenses as a separate race among these latter,—that we may not fall into the error of Mosheim, who ascribes the origin of that sect to an individual named Waldus. Peter Waldus, or Waldensis, a native of Lyons, was a layman and a merchant; but, notwithstanding the avocations of a secular life, he had studied the real character of his church with attention, followed by shame. Stung by the spectacle of so much impurity*, he abandoned his profession, distributed his wealth among the poor, and formed an association for the diffusion of scriptural truth. He commenced his ministry about the year 1180. Having previously caused several parts of the Scriptures to be translated into the vulgar tongue, he expounded them with great effect to an attentive body of disciples, both in France and Lombardy. In the course of his exertions he probably visited the valleys of Piedmont; and there he found a people of congenial spirits. They were called Vaudois or Waldenses (Men of the Valleys); and as the preaching of Peter may probably have confirmed their opinions, and cemented their discipline, he acquired and deserved his surname by his residence among them. At the same time, their connexion with Peter and his real Lyonnese disciples established a notion of their identity; and the Vaudois, in return for the title which they had bestowed, received the

* It is said that the worship of the Host, which was first enforced about this time, was the particular superstition which awakened the indignation of Peter Waldus. If, indeed, that practice was generally established in 1180, there remained little for Innocent to add to the sanctity of the sacrament thirty-five years afterwards. There is no mention of it in the ancient canonical books of the church,—those of Alcuin, Amalarius, Walfridus, and Micrologus. There is proof, however, that it existed in France, both at Paris and at Tours, a century at least before Innocent III. In Germany there is also evidence of its previous existence. But in the Roman church it does not appear to have been established before the pontificate of Boniface VIII. See Page, Vit. Innoc. III. ad finem.

reciprocal appellation of Leonists : such, at least, appears the most probable among many varying accounts*.

There are some who believe the Vaudois to have enjoyed the uninterrupted integrity of the faith even from the apostolic ages ; others suppose them to have been disciples of Claudius Turin, the evangelical prelate of the ninth century. At least, it may be pronounced with great certainty, that they had been long in existence before the visit of the Lyonnese reformer. A Dominican, named Rainer Saccho, who was first a member and afterwards a persecutor of their communion, described them, in a treatise which he wrote against them, to the following purpose : ‘ There is no sect so dangerous as the Leonists, for three reasons : first, it is the most ancient,—some say as old as Sylvester, others as the apostles themselves. Secondly, it is very generally disseminated : there is no country where it has not gained some footing. Thirdly, while other sects are profane and blasphemous, this retains the utmost show of piety ; they live justly before men, and believe nothing respecting God which is not good ; only they blaspheme against the Roman church and the clergy, and thus gain many followers†. The author of this passage lived about the middle of the following century ; and if the sect against which he was writing had really originated from the preaching of Peter some eighty years before, the Dominican would scarcely have conceded to it the claim of high and unascertained antiquity. Again, St. Bernard in one place admits, in substance, ‘ that there is a sect, which calls itself after no man’s name‡, which pretends to be in the direct line of apostolical succession ; and which, rustic and unlearned though it is, contends that the church is wrong, and that itself alone is right. It must derive (he subjoins) its origin from the devil ; since there is no other extraction which we can assign to it.’

At the same time we must admit that the direct historical evidence is not sufficient to prove the apostolical descent of the Vaudois§. Alcuin, the tutor of Charlemagne, may have complained ‘ that auricular confession was not practised in the churches of Languedoc and the Alps in his time.’ Claudius of Turin may have presided over a reformed and Christian diocese. Somewhat later (in 945), Atto, Bishop of Vercell||, may have lamented ‘ that there were *some* in his diocese who held the divine services in derision.’ And lastly, at the Synod of Arras, in 1025, it may have been deplored, ‘ that certain persons, coming from the borders of Italy, had introduced heretical doctrines,’—and such as the Waldenses, indeed, professed. It still appears that the name is not mentioned in any writing before the twelfth century ; and there is no direct specific evidence of the previous existence of the sect. Nevertheless, as its origin was confessedly immemorial in the thirteenth century, and as there has not,

* There are some who derive the surname of Peter from some town or hamlet in the vicinity of Lyons ; others contend that he never personally preached among the Vaudois of Piedmont.

† Bibliotheca Patrum, apud Lenfant, Guerre des Hussites, liv. ii., sect. v.

‡ Quære ab illis sue sectæ auctorem, neminem dabit. Quæ hæresis non ex hominibus habuit proprium hæresiarcham ? Manichæi Manem habuere principem et præceptorem, Sabelliani Sabellium, &c. Ita omnes ceteræ hujusmodi pestes singulæ singulos magistros homines habuisse noscuntur, a quibus originem simul duxere et nomen. Quo nomine istos titulove vocabis ? Nullo ; quoniam non est ab homine illorum hæresis,....sed magis et absque dubio per immissionem et fraudem dæmoniorum, &c. Sermo super Caut. lxvi. ad init.

§ We refer to Mr. Gilly’s well-known work on this subject.

|| A city situated between Turin and Milan.

perhaps, existed in the history of heresy any other sect to which some origin has not been expressly ascribed, we have just reason to infer the very high antiquity of the Vaudois.

Many will think it more important to learn their doctrines, than to speculate on their origin. On almost all material points they were those of the Reformation *. In their discipline they endeavoured to attain the rigid simplicity of the primitive Christians, and in that endeavour, perhaps, they exceeded it; for while they maintained and imitated the divine institution of the three orders in the priesthood, they also reduced their clergy to the temporal condition of the apostles themselves; they denied them all worldly possessions, and while they obliged them to be poor and industrious, they compelled them to be illiterate also.

The persecution of Peter Waldensis, and the dispersion of his followers, occasioned, as in so many similar instances, the dissemination of the opinions; and, notwithstanding some partial sufferings which were inflicted in Picardy by Philippe Auguste, they were a numerous and flourishing sect at the conclusion of the twelfth century. They were often confounded in name with the Vaudois, in crime and calamity with the Catharists and Petrobrussians, and other adversaries of Papacy.

But of these various descriptions, such as were found in France during the pontificate of Innocent, were known by the general name of Albigeois or Albigenses. A city in Lan- *The Albigeois.* guedoc, named Albi†, which was peculiarly prolific of heresy, is usually supposed to have given a common designation to these numerous forms of error. Such, very briefly described, were the factions which distracted the church on the accession of Innocent III. It now remains to observe the measures which he adopted to repress them. And let us first inquire to what extent he might plead the previous practice of the church.

It appears that, at a Synod held at Orleans, in the year 1017, under the reign of Robert, a number of persons, of no mean condition or character, were accused of heretical opinions. Manicheism was the frightful term, employed to express their delinquency; but it is more probable that their real offence was the adoption of certain mystical notions, proceeding, indeed, from feelings of the most earnest piety, but too spiritual to be tolerated in that age and that church. It is said that they despised all external forms of worship, and rejected the rites, the ceremonies, and even the sacraments of the church; that they valued none save the religion within,—the abstracted contemplation of the Deity, and the internal aspirations of the soul after things celestial. Some philosophical speculations they may also have admitted respecting God, the Trinity, and the human soul, which

* Reiser, the Dominican, already cited, also divides the crimes of the Vaudois into three classes: 1. Their blasphemies against the church, its statutes, and its clergy; 2. Errors touching the sacraments and the saints; 3. Detestation of all honest customs approved by the church; which really means, objections to the administration, the sacraments, and the practices of the Roman Catholic church. Mosheim treats the subject at Cent. xii., p. ii., ch. v. Pierre d'Ailly, in a discourse composed at the Council of Constance, alleges as their principal errors, that they refused temporalities to the priesthood, and asserted that the church of God only lasted till the endowment by Constantine. Then arose the church of Rome,—the other being extinct, except in as far as it was perpetuated in themselves.

† According to the *Histoire Générale de Languedoc*, by the Benedictine monks, the term is more accurately derived from Albigensium, the general denomination of Narbonne Gaul in that century. See Mosh., note on Cent. xiii., p. ii., ch. v., sect. vii.

excited the fears of that generation*, in the same degree that they surpassed its comprehension. Accordingly; they were accused and convicted of heresy; and as they firmly persisted in their errors, and as the king had no repugnance to enforce the sentence, they were finally consigned to the flames.

In this barbarous transaction, which was rather in anticipation of the policy of later ages, than in accordance with that of the eleventh, we have found no proof of papal interference; nor, indeed, have we observed any very important pontifical edicts for the extirpation of heresy, earlier than the reign of Alexander III. That Pope, in a council held at Tours in 1163, published a decree to this effect: 'Whereas a damnable heresy has for some time lifted its head in the parts about Toulouse, and has already spread its infection through Gascony and other provinces, concealing itself like a serpent within its own folds; as soon as its followers shall have been discovered, let no man afford them a refuge on his estates; neither let there be any communication with them in buying or selling; so that, being deprived of the solace of human conversation, they may be compelled to return from error to wisdom.'

The same pontiff, in the third Lateran Council, held in 1179, published other edicts against the heretics, variously named Cathari, Paterini, Publicani, &c., pursuing them with anathemas, refusal of Christian sepulture, and other spiritual chastisements. But it does not appear that he invoked, on either occasion, the secular arm to his assistance. Nevertheless, without that aid, his power was sufficient to expel Peter Waldensis from his native city, and subsequently to pursue him from Dauphiny to Picardy, and thence to Germany, till he found his final resting-place among the Bohemian mountaineers, the ancestors of Huss and Jerome. The fugitive died in that country about the year 1180.

When the torch of persecution was transmitted to Innocent†, the two principal seats of religious disaffection were the valleys of Piedmont and the cities of Languedoc; with this difference, however, that the Vaudois flourished in comparative and perhaps despised security, while the latter, more

* Such, at least, is the opinion of Mosheim (Cent. xi., p. ii., ch. v.) The history of this Synod of Orleans is found in Dacherius's *Spicilegium Veter. Script.* (tom. ii., p. 670, Edit. Paris,) and the charges there alleged (besides the usual calumny of promiscuous prostitution) respect the nativity, the death and resurrection of Christ, and impute a disbelief in the efficacy of baptism, in the change wrought by consecration in the eucharistical elements, and in the meritoriousness of prayers to martyrs and confessors. In the place of this faith they substituted 'celestial food,' 'angelic visions,' 'the companionship of God,' &c... and when the prelate sitting in judgment on them laid down the orthodox doctrine respecting some of those points, the heretics replied, 'You may tell such tales as those to men whose wisdom is of this world, and who believe the fictions of carnal men, written on the skins (membranæ) of animals. But to us, who have a law inscribed on the inward man by the Holy Spirit, and who have no other wisdom than that which we have learnt from God the creator of all things, you preach superfluous vanities, deviating from real holiness. Wherefore, cease from your discourse, and do what you will with us. Already do we behold our King reigning in the heavens, who exalts us with his right hand to immortal triumphs, and to the joys which are above.' We should recollect that this account (like almost every other in which any heretical opinions are described) comes to us from the pen of an enemy.

† The original is given by Pagi, Vit. Alexandri III., sect. xlii. He continues to apply to them, according to the ordinary confusion, the name of Waldenses.

‡ That Innocent was very ready to take his turn in this lampadephory appears from several epistles, written to various prelates in the very first year of his pontificate, in which

particularly denominated Albigeois, were rendered more notorious, as well as more dangerous, by the protection publicly afforded them by Raymond VI., Earl of Toulouse*. Against these, therefore, the Pope's earnest and most assiduous efforts were directed; and first, observing that the bishops in those provinces were deficient in true Catholic zeal for the Unity of the Church, he sent, in 1198, two legates into the rebellious districts; but rather, as it would seem, for the purpose of exploring and menacing, than of actually commencing the contest. Presently afterwards, a more numerous commission, the advance of his array, invaded the haunts of heresy, and brought argument and eloquence in support of intimidation. This body again received great additional efficiency from the accession of a Spaniard, named *Dominic*, a young ecclesiastic, remarkable for the severity of his life, the extent of his learning, the persuasiveness of his manner, and the ardour of his zeal. These qualities, and some successful services, infused a new spirit into the ranks of the orthodox. It would also appear that their exertions were no longer restricted to verbal exhortation and reproof; but that they also aimed to animate the civil authorities in their favour, and to enforce the infliction even of capital punishment, whenever they had influence to do so. This expedition lasted six or seven years; and, at the end of that time, the spiritual missionaries engaged in it were generally known by the title of *Inquisitors*,—a name, not indeed honourable or innocent even in its origin, but not yet associated with horror and infamy.

Still matters did not proceed with the rapidity desired by the pontiff; and then the missionaries had recourse to a new and very harmless expedient to accelerate success. They laid aside the pomp and dignity of their train and habits, discharged the unpopular parade of servants and equipage, and continued their preaching with the more imposing pretension of apostolical humility. But neither had this method the result which was hoped from it. At length, in the year 1207, Innocent at once addressed himself to the arms of Philippe Auguste. He easily exhorted that monarch to march into the heretical provinces, and extirpate the spiritual rebels by fire and sword.

About the same time one of his legates or inquisitors, Pierre de Castelnov† (or Chateau-neuf), was assassinated by the populace in the states of Raymond. The act was imputed to the connivance, if not to the direct instigation, of that prince‡. The Pope immediately launched the bolt of excommunication; and his emissaries, by his command, proceeded to those measures which introduced a new feature into the history of inter-Christian warfare. They proclaimed a general campaign of all na-

he exhorts them to gird themselves for the work of extirpation, and to employ, if necessary, the arms of the princes and of the people. This last suggestion was provident. The populace might sometimes be excited to an act of outrage, when the authorities were neutral in the quarrel.

* Limborch, in the first book of his *History of the Inquisition* (cap. viii.), very clearly shows, both from the '*Sententia Inquisitionis Tolositanae*,' and other evidence, that the Vaudois, while they held some opinions in common with the Albigenes, had many more points of difference, in rites as well as in doctrine; for instance, the Manichean errors imputed to the latter are never ascribed to the Vaudois.

† Some write the name Castronovo.

‡ Historians differ as to the probability of his guilt; also as to the fact whether the first appeal of Innocent to the court of France preceded or followed the death of his legate. On this point we incline to the former opinion. Respecting the charge against Raymond, there seems to be no clear proof on either side; it is known that he favoured the heretics, and that circumstance might occasion either the crime or the calumny. The latter is, *perhaps*, the more probable

tions against the Albigeois, and at the same time promised a general grant of indulgences and dispensations to all who should take arms in that holy cause. Having thus reduced those dissenting Christians to the same level in a religious estimation with the Turk and the Saracen, they let loose an infuriated multitude of fanatics against them; and the word 'Crusade,' which had hitherto signified only religious madness, was now extended to the more deliberate atrocity of sectarian persecution.

Several monks and some prelates were the spiritual directors of this tempest; but the military leader was Simon, Count *de Montfort*, 'a man like Cromwell, whose intrepidity, hypocrisy and ambition marked him for the hero of a holy war*.' To irritate his ambition, the Pope artfully held out to him the earldom of Toulouse, as the recompense of his exertions in the service of the church. His hypocrisy was displayed and hardened by the seeming devotion with which he continually perpetrated the most revolting enormities, and his intrepidity was exercised by the resistance of the heretics. It would be a painful office, and of little profit, in the present prevalence of reason and of humanity, to pursue the frightful details of religious massacre †. It is sufficient to say, that after many conflicts and some variety of success, but no intermission of barbarity, the triumph rested with the Catholics. It was not, however, so complete as either to exterminate the rebels, or to place the promised sceptre in the hand of the persecutor. In the year 1218, Montfort was killed in battle before the walls of the city ‡, which Innocent had vainly bestowed on him.

The contest was continued by succeeding Popes according to the principles of Innocent; and eight years after the death of Montfort, Louis VIII. king of France was engaged to gird on the sword of persecution.

Another crusade was preached, and in 1228 a system of Inquisition was permanently established within the walls of Toulouse. In the same, or

* Hallam, Middle Ages. Simon de Montfort was descended, by an illegitimate branch, from Robert king of France. He was connected on his mother's side with the Earls of Leicester.

† It was said in this war, when the Crusaders were on the point of storming Beziers, that some one inquired how the Catholic were to be distinguished from the heretical inhabitants in the massacre about to take place: 'Kill them all (replied Arnold, a Cistercian abbot, who happened to be present), God will know his own.' *Cædite—novit Dominus, qui sunt ejus.* His advice appears to have been followed, and about seven thousand of all persuasions suffered.

The Life of Innocent III. apud Muratori, (which is more properly the History of Montfort's wars,) mentions many instances in which small bodies of heretics chose to be burnt, rather than return to the Catholic faith.

‡ The recorded circumstances of his death seem well to illustrate one trait at least in his character. He was at matins (on June 25,) when he was informed that the enemy were in arms, and concealed in the fosse of the fortress. He instantly armed also, and hastened to church to hear mass. Mass was just begun, and he was engaged in earnest prayer, when news were brought him that the Toulousans had made a sally, and were attacking his machines—'Let me finish the mass (he replied) and see the sacrament of our redemption.' Instantly afterwards another courier arrived, and said, 'Hasten to the succour; our men are pressed, and can hold out no longer.' 'I will not stir (he answered) until I have seen my Saviour.' But as soon as the priest had lifted up the Host, according to the usage, the Count, with his knees still on earth, and his hands raised to heaven, exclaimed, '*Nunc dimittis,*' and he then added, 'Let us now go and die, if necessary, for Him who has died for us.' Accordingly he went forth and died. Yet, after all, it were too much to ascribe this conduct to pure hypocrisy; much of fanaticism was undoubtedly mixed with it; and when religious enthusiasm is united, as has too commonly happened, with religious hypocrisy, it is impossible even for the person possessed with them to distinguish their limits.

the following year, a Council there assembled published decrees, which obliged laymen, even of the highest rank, to close their houses, cellars, forests, against the heretical fugitives; and to take all means to detect and bring them to trial; heretics voluntarily converted were compelled to wear certain crosses on their garments; those who should return to the church, under the influence of fear, were still to suffer imprisonment at the discretion of the bishop; all children of the age of twelve or fourteen were compelled by oath, not only to abjure every heresy, but to expose and denounce any which they should detect in others; and this code of bigotry was properly completed by a strict prohibition to all laymen to possess any copies of the Scriptures*.

Still the Count, who succeeded to the sceptre and to the moderation of Raymond, manifested not sufficient ardour in the Catholic cause, and it was not till the Archbishop of the city was formally associated with him in the office of destruction, that the work was thought to proceed with becoming rapidity†. At length, in 1253, the Count entered seriously on the hateful task; and from that moment the remnant of the Albigeois were consigned, without hope or mercy, to the eager hands of the inquisitors.

Innocent did not himself live to behold the success of his measures; and the cause which is assigned for his premature death is the more remarkable‡, as it arose out of *Death and Character of Innocent.* the most triumphant exploit in his life. Since the humiliation of John, the crown of England had been considered by the Pope as a possession valuable to his ambition no less than to his avarice :

* Some of the statutes of this Council are worth citing, as they show not only how far the system, strictly speaking inquisitorial, was carried in that early age, but also how closely the laity at that time co-operated with the clergy for the unity of the church:—*‘Statuimus itaque ut archiepiscopi et episcopi in singulis parochiis, tam in civitatibus quam extra, sacerdotem unum et duos vel tres laicos vel plures etiam, si opus fuerit, juramenti religione constringant, quod diligenter, fideliter et frequenter inquirent hæreticos in iisdem parochiis, domos singulas et cameras subterraneas aliqua suspitione notabiles perscrutando, et appensa seu adjuncta in iis tectis ædificia, seu quæcunque alia latibula (quæ omnia destrui præcipimus) perquirendo reperiunt hæreticos, credentes, fautores et receptatores seu defensores eorum, &c. . . . Solliciti etiam sint domini terrarum circa inquisitionem hæreticorum, in villis, domibus et memoribus faciendam; et circa hujusmodi appensa, adjuncta, seu subterranea latibula destruenda. Statuimus igitur ut quicumque in terra permittat scienter morari hæreticum . . . et fuerit inde confessus et convictus, amittat in perpetuum totam suam terram, et corpus suum sit in manu domini ad faciendum inde quod debebit. Illam domum in qua fuerit inventus hæreticus diruendam decernimus; et locus sive fundus ipse confiscetur.’ &c.—See Spicileg. Dacherii (vol. ii. p. 621. Edit. Paris.) under the head, ‘Varia Gallie Concilia.’*

† We read in Matthew Paris, that about the year 1236, the Frates Predicatores and other divines were still making great exertions for the conversion of the misbelievers. One of those preachers, named Robert, was so powerful in prostrating an adversary as to have obtained the name of *Malleus Hæreticorum*—the Hammer of Heretics. Nor was this only meant in a spiritual sense, ‘since there were many of both sexes whom, being unable to convert, he caused to be burnt to death; so that within two or three months there were about fifty persons whom he occasioned either to be burnt or buried alive.’—*Matth. Paris, Henric. III., ad an. 1236.* We should add, however, for the honour of pontifical humanity, that only two years afterwards the cruelties of Robert were arrested by an order from Rome, and the persecutor (who, by the way, had previously been a heretic) was himself convicted of some less equivocal offences, and imprisoned for life.

‡ Some writers make no mention of this circumstance, but merely assert that Innocent died rather suddenly, while on his way to reconcile some differences between the Pisans and Genoese, which impeded his grand crusading projects.—See the Chron. of Richardus de S. Germano, and of Urspergensis Abbas. ap. Pagi, Vit. Innoc. III. Sect. 104. It is certain that his death took place at Perugia, on July 16, 1216, after a reign of eighteen years and six months.

and when, on the deposition of John, Louis of France was proclaimed, and actually proceeded to occupy the country in spite of the Pontiff's determined opposition, Innocent was indignant at the affront and the injury. He preached a sermon on some public occasion, and selected for his text, 'Even say thou, the sword, the sword is drawn—for the slaughter it is furnished*.' In the course of his passionate harangue he pronounced a solemn sentence of excommunication against Louis and his followers; and immediately afterwards, as it is said, while in the act of dictating to his secretary some very harsh censures against Philippe and his kingdom, he was seized by that fatal fever, which was ordained, perhaps, to prevent some new enterprise of warfare and desolation.

If we would reconcile the lofty panegyrics with the violent vituperation, which are alike bestowed upon the name of Innocent III., we must first distinguish his private from his public character, and next reflect how different and even opposite are the principles on which the latter has, in different ages, been judged. The very same exploits which would naturally call forth loud approbation from the Catholic historians of those days, nay, from some perhaps even at this moment, are made the subjects of severe censure by Protestant writers. This difference is less properly historical than moral. It does not respect the reality of the questionable acts ascribed to him, but only the light in which we are bound to regard them. But in respect to the private qualities of Innocent there is no ground for such diversity; and that they were great and noble is attested by most of his biographers. That he was gifted with extraordinary talents—that he was a profound canonist, and generally conversant with the learning of his time—that he was frequent in charitable offices, and generous in the distribution of his personal revenues—that his moral conduct was without reproach, and that he was sometimes not untouched by sentiments of piety, is clear from the evidence of contemporary authors and of his own writings. But great personal virtues are perfectly consistent with great public crimes; and it is a truth which leads to melancholy reflection, that some of the heaviest evils which have ever been inflicted upon churches and nations, have proceeded from the weak or even wicked policy of men of immaculate private characters.

Such was Innocent III.; charitable to the poor who surrounded his palace, steeled against the wretch who deviated from his faith—generous in the profusion of his private expenditure, avaricious in the exactions which he levied for the apostolical treasury—humane† in his mere social relations, merciless in the execution of his ecclesiastical projects—pious in the expressions of internal devotion, impious and blasphemous in his repeated profanation of the name of God and of the cross of Christ.

Again: if we confine our retrospect to the public acts of this Pontiff, we observe that they bear, perhaps without any exception, the same stamp—that of a temporal and worldly policy. Innocent subjected the civil authority of the Imperial Prefect to his own. He extended, with great diligence, the boundaries of the Ecclesiastical States. He found means to control a great portion of the secular power of Europe, so that he might hold it at

* Ezekiel, c. xxi. v. 28.

† Simon de Montfort killed Peter of Arragon in battle, and took his son prisoner. The widow, unable to prevail with Montfort for the release of the boy, supplicated the interference of Innocent. There is no proof that his policy was, in this matter, concerned on either side, so he commanded the liberation of the captive, and for once humanity had its triumph.

his disposal; whether it was his will to overthrow a pretender, or to depose a king, or to extinguish a heresy. For the accomplishment of his most important objects his final and most confident appeal was invariably made to the material sword. Again: as if it were little to submit the consciences of men to the dominion of the Holy See, he endeavoured to comprehend in its grasp their property also. Heretofore the Popes had been contented with the exercise and the rewards of a spiritual tyranny—they had been satisfied with the obedience, the ecclesiastical fidelity, the ghostly services of their clergy; but Innocent opened a more direct and, as he thought, a more solid path to power. He availed himself of the pretext of the crusades to levy pecuniary contributions, immediately on the clergy, and, through the clergy, on the people. *This* was the most essential change which he introduced into the system of the church. From this epoch its history takes another, and we need not hesitate to say, a lower character; and though this was not instantly developed, but awaited the profligacy of Avignon, and the vices and necessities of the Schism, to bring it to full perfection, still it was from this crisis that the revolution must be dated; here originated that gradual substitution of worldly objects and vulgar motives for the splendour of spiritual pretension, which led, through a succession of pitiful disputes and sordid usurpations, to mere naked avarice and avowed and shameless venality.

In the comparison which we might here be tempted to draw between Innocent III. and the greatest among his predecessors, there is perhaps no point on which the preference could be refused to Gregory. Both availed themselves of the divisions of the empire; but the favourable circumstances which Innocent found, Gregory in a great measure created. The design of universal monarchy, which was carried so far into execution by the one, was conceived and transmitted to him by the other. With Innocent the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre was made the excuse for pecuniary exactions; with Gregory it was the lofty aspiration of erring magnanimity, earnest, and attended by a determination to devote his repose and person to the cause which he deemed holy. In the treatment of heretical delinquency, the one was moderate * beyond the principles of his age and the passions of his clergy; the other urged the course and heated the rage of persecution, and by his perversion of the crusading frenzy into that channel, identified in the popular hatred dissent with infidelity, and established the law of vengeance, and multiplied the crimes of his posterity. And after all, how severely soever we may condemn the means which have created it, there is something of majesty and magnificence in the character of a spiritual despotism—an invisible power which enthralled mankind without the aid of physical force, and even in defiance of it; which humbles the mightiest sceptre, and blunts the sharpest sword by a menace or a censure; a power mysterious and undefinable, swaying the human race by the name—the much-abused name—of religion. If we look, indeed, to its origin, it is only an empire over man's ignorance and credulity. Still it is the empire of intellect; and as such it stands on loftier ground than that worldly fabric which employed the ambition of Innocent; the mere temporal sovereignty of arms and opulence, supported by corruption and massacre.

* It is true, that Gregory offered to Sweno, King of Denmark, a province occupied by heretics. But in this matter his temporal ambition was probably more interested than his ecclesiastical bigotry.

CHAPTER XIX.

The History of Monachism.

(I.) *Origin of Monachism*—Early instance of the monastic spirit in the east—Pliny the philosopher—The Therapeutæ or Essenes—The Ascetics—their real character and origin—The earliest Christian hermits—dated from the Decian or Diocletian persecutions—Cœnobites. Pachomius and St. Anthony—originated in Egypt—account of the monks of Egypt—Basilius of Cæsarea—his order and rule—his institution of a new questionable—Monasteries encouraged by the fathers of the fourth and fifteenth ages—from what motives—Vow of celibacy—Restrictions of admission into monastic order—Original monks were laymen—Comparative fanaticism of the east and west—Severity of discipline in the west—motives and inducements to it—contrasted with the Oriental practice—Establishment of nunneries in the east. (II.) *Institution of Monachism in the West*—St. Athanasius—Martin of Tours—Most ancient rule of the western monasteries—their probable paucity and poverty—Benedict of Nursia—his order, and reasonable rule, and object—Foundation of Monte Cassino—France—St. Columban—Ravages of the Lombards and Danes—Reform by Benedict of Aniane—The order of Cluni—its origin, rise, and reputation—its attachment to papacy and its prosperity—The order of Cîteaux—date of its foundation—Dependent Abbey of Clairvaux—St. Bernard—its progress and decline—Order of the Chartreux. (III.) *General Regular and Secular*—Order of St. Augustin—Rule of Chrodegangus—Rule of Aix-la-Chapelle—subsequent reforms, (IV.) Connexion between the monasteries and the Pope—mutual services. *The Military orders*—(1.) The Knights of the Hospital—origin of their institution—their discipline and character—(2.) Knights Templar—their origin and object—(3.) The Teutonic order—its establishment and prosperity. (V.) *The Mendicant orders*—causes of their rise and great progress—(1.) St. Dominic—his exertions and designs—(2.) St. Francis and his followers—compared with the Dominicans—apparent assimilation—essential differences—disputes of the Franciscans with the Popes, and among themselves—Inquisitorial office of the Dominicans, their learning and influence—quarrels with the Doctors of Paris—Austerity of the Franciscans—the Fratricelli—(3.) The Carmelites—their professed origin—(4.) Hermits of St. Augustin—Privileges of these four orders. (VI.) *Various establishments of Nuns*—their usual offices and character—General remarks—The three grand orders of the Western Church (suited to the ages in which they severally appeared and flourished)—The Jesuits—The Monastic system one of perpetual reformation—thus alone it survived so long—its merits and advantages—The bodily labour of the Monks—their charitable and hospitable offices—real piety to be found among them—superintendence of education, and means of learning preserved by them—limits to their utility—their frequent alliance with superstition—their early dependence on the Bishops—gradual exemption, and final subjection to the Pope—Their profits and opulence, and means of amassing it—Luther a mendicant.

It is not through inadvertence, nor any blindness to the magnitude and importance of the subject, that a particular account of the monastic system has been so long deferred. We have had frequent occasion to recognize its existence and its influence on the general character of the Church; and it was reasonable perhaps to expect some earlier notice of its origin and progress. But as it is absolutely necessary for the correct comprehension of ecclesiastical history, that the scheme of monachism be understood aright; as that end could scarcely be accomplished, unless by presenting the entire institution at a single view; and as it is much more instructive, in the order of historical composition, to retrace some steps and to revisit such periods as have been examined imperfectly, rather than to anticipate events and ages which are remote and wholly unexplored—for these reasons we have abstained from a partial or premature treatment of this extensive subject. Moreover, when we consider the successive mutations which have perpetually varied the aspect of monasticism, it will appear, perhaps, that the present, as being the epoch of its latest change, is the moment most proper for the delineation of the whole structure. That latest change (we speak only of changes preceding the Reformation) was the institution of the Mendicant Orders—an event which arose out of the ministry of St. Dominic, and immediately followed the death of Innocent III. This appendage completed the

anomalous fabric: and while it was so closely intermixed with the peculiar circumstances of the age, that its nature could not have been rightly comprehended, unless described in connexion with them; it was at the same time an innovation so essentially affecting the form and character of monachism, that any account, not embracing it, would have conveyed very imperfect and even erroneous notions. Led by such considerations, we have selected the present period for this purpose; not unmindful how little justice after all can possibly be done to materials so ample within such scanty limits, and almost despairing to throw any new light on a subject which has exercised the genius, and deserved—as it still deserves—the deepest meditation both of historians and philosophers.

SECTION I.

The origin of Monachism and its progress in the East.

THE monastic spirit was alike congenial to the scenery and climate of the East, and to the peculiar character of its inhabitants. Vast solitudes of unbroken and unbounded expanse; rocks, with the most grotesque outlines, abounding in natural excavations; a dry air and an unclouded sky, afforded facilities—might we not say temptations—to a wild, unsocial, and contemplative life. The serious enthusiasm of the natives of Egypt and Asia, that combination of indolence with energy, of the calmest languor with the fiercest passion, which marks their features and their actions, disposed them to embrace with eagerness the tranquil but exciting duties of religious seclusion. And thus, even in earlier ages, before the zeal of devotion superseded all other motives to retirement, we observe, without any surprise, the mention of that practice, as indigenous and immemorial.

Pliny* the philosopher has recorded the existence of an extraordinary race, who lived on the borders of the Dead Sea, the associates of the palm trees; and who *Therapeutæ* or *Essenes*, had been perpetuated (as it was said) through thousands of ages without women and without property. Satiety and disgust with the business of life, rather than any religious feeling, are mentioned as the motives of their seclusion. Again, it is certain that the *Therapeutæ* or *Essenes* inhabited the deserts both of Egypt and of Syria, as early as the days of our Saviour. They had probably dwelt there long before that time; and they appear to have sought to exalt the merit of their retirement by the practice of great austerities. Some Roman Catholic writers, being anxious to prove Monachism coeval with Christianity, have asserted, on the authority of Eusebius†, Sozomen, and Cassian, that the *Therapeutæ* were Christians; and that they scattered the seeds of the monastic life through the populous villages of Lower

* Lib. v. cap. xvii. Ab occidente Judææ litore Esseni fugitant; gens sola et in toto orbe præter cæteras mira, sine ulla foemina, omni Venere abdicata, sine pecunia, socia palmarum. Indiem ex æquo advenarum turba renascitur, longe frequentantibus quos vita fessos ad mores eorum fortuna fluctibus agit. Ita per sæculorum millia (incredible dictu) gens æterna in qua nemo nascitur. Tam fecunda illis aliorum vitæ penitentia est. The most important references on this subject are collected by Hospinian. Orig. Monach.—Lib. I. cap. v.

† Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. c. xvi. He applied to the Christians that which Philo had written about the Jewish Essenes. Such at least is the opinion of Marsham, a very impartial as well as learned writer, in his *Περὶ Ἰουδαίου* to Dugdale's *Monasticon*.—See Joseph. de Bell. Judææ, lib. ii. cap. vii. for a particular description of that sect,

Egypt, whilst St. Marc, their founder, presided over the Church of Alexandria. But the opinion is more probable, that they were, for the most part, Jews by religion as well as by birth; and of a much earlier origin. Nevertheless, it may well be, that such of them as became converts to the faith, still retained their rigid eremitical life; nor can it be doubted, that the example of their severities, and the popular respect which followed them, would excite the attention and emulation of surrounding Christians.

This is one of the causes to which we may attribute the very early existence of a sect unquestionably Christian, called *The Ascetics*. the Ascetics; and these also have been erroneously confounded with the original Monks. The term Ascetic was applied by early * Christian writers to the most rigid and zealous among the primitive converts, whether they exhibited their fervour in unusual assiduity in prayer and the offices of charity, or extended it to the more equivocal merits of fasting and celibacy. But these persons did not withdraw themselves from the world; they merely exercised with ardour, perhaps in extravagance, the virtues which best qualified them to benefit and amend it. Possibly, in their rigid devotion to the duties of society, they may have shunned with aversion even its most innocent amusements. But such pious excess, which has ever marked the best forms and ages of Christianity, was eminently useful to its propagation, and should be sparingly censured under any circumstances †. It is at least manifest, that the rule of the Ascetics was essentially at variance with the monastic principle; they dwelt and associated with their fellow Christians; and perhaps they might never have acquired the historical distinction of a name, had it not been, that they affected a different garb, and assumed the philosophical cloak as the badge of their sect. Their origin is attributed by Mosheim‡ to the double doctrine of morals, which he supposes to have prevailed in the second century—so that, while vulgar Christians were contented to obey the *precepts* of the Gospel; those who aimed at higher perfection, professed to be also directed by its *counsels*. This notion is unquestionably borrowed from heathen philosophy; and, if it really existed to any extent among the Ascetics, it affords another proof of their connexion with the schools of Greece. But the unsettled condition of the Church in those days, and the jealousies and sufferings to which it was subjected; the general demoralization of the pagan world, the example of popular austerities in another religion, and the melancholy genius of Egypt, where Ascetism chiefly prevailed, were causes alone sufficient to have produced—as they did produce—forms of enthusiasm far less rational, than any which can justly be ascribed to the Ascetics.

But about the middle of the third century the monastic spirit exhibited itself in a much less equivocal shape; and we may observe that the

* Bingham (Christ. Antiq. b. vii.) confirms his account of the Ascetics by numerous and conclusive authorities.

† The Ascetics were of all ranks and professions. Eusebius calls them *σι σπουδαίοι*—the zealous. Clemens Alexandrinus *ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι*—the more elect among the elect. These expressions imply nothing more than a greater fervour (or at least greater pretension) of piety.

‡ The same writer (Cent. iii., p. 2., ch. ii.) seems disposed to attribute the rise of Monks and Hermits to the influence of the mystical theology. Yet he admits, in the same paragraph, that that method of life was very common in Egypt, Syria, India, and Mesopotamia even before the coming of Christ.

purest and most legitimate character of seclusion was that which it first assumed. Flying from the fury of the Decian persecution, a number of Christians took refuge in caves, in deserts, or *Anchorets*: inaccessible islets, where they exercised their proscribed religion in solitary security. Egypt and Syria, and Mesopotamia, and the wildest parts of Asia Minor, were suddenly visited by a race of exiles, in whom devotion, irritated by injustice and fed by seclusion, sometimes sank into sullen and gloomy fanaticism. These probably were the earliest Christian Hermits or Anchorets; they professed an absolute religious solitude, occasionally interrupted indeed by the pious importunity of the neighbouring inhabitants, but never broken by any regular connexion or association with each other. Their numbers were further increased by the severities of Diocletian; and still more, perhaps, by the reverence and sympathy, which the spectacle of their austere piety excited among the vulgar. They continued for some time to deserve by their habits the title of Solitaries; nor do we learn that they were formed into assemblies until after the establishment of the Church by Constantine.

The first institution of persons *living in common* for religious purposes, and therefore called *Cœnobites*, is attributed to St. Anthony, the contemporary and friend of Athanasius, and his fellow-*Cœnobites*. labourer in the same soil. And it is obvious to remark, that while the greater of those champions of the ancient Church was engaged in defending the purity of the Christian faith, in the schools of Alexandria, the other was scattering in the same soil, with the same applause and success, the seeds of a system directly at variance with some of its best practical principles. Another Egyptian, named Pachomius, divides with St. Anthony the fame of this enterprise; in as far at least as he immediately extended to the Upper Thebaid the work which Anthony commenced in the Lower*. He even ventured thus early to enlarge upon the first scheme of religious union; and introduced the custom, which in much later ages was so generally adopted in the Western Church, of combining several monasteries into one Society, or 'Congregation.' These events took place during the first half of the fourth century; and it is from this epoch that we properly date the origin of the monastic system.

The multitudes who instantly embraced that manner of life, and thronged the primitive edifices of Upper Egypt, were, no doubt, exaggerated, when calculated at nearly half the population of the country. But it is certain, that the 'New Philosophy' (it was early designated by that name) was eagerly adopted by a crowd of proselytes; nor is this wonderful; since those to whom its advantages were the most obvious, and its duties the most easy, were the lowest of mankind—and since in Egypt, more than in any other land, religious novelties have flourished from the remotest ages with a peculiar fecundity.

Since the original monks of Egypt are praised by Roman Catholic writers, as the true models of monastic perfection, and since some accounts of them remain, *The Monks of Egypt*. which may be followed with little suspicion, it is proper to employ some additional attention on that subject. John Casian, a native of Scythia, a deacon by the ordination of St. Chrysostom, and an inmate of the Monastery of Palestine, near Bethlehem, went forth, about the year 395, to explore the holy solitudes of Egypt, and draw from

* Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, Dissert. Prélim.

its more perfect institutions a profitable lesson of religious instruction; and seven years devoted to those inquiries give weight and credit to the descriptions which he published. The latter part of his life was passed in retirement at Marseilles; and to the two convents which he there established, he prescribed a rule founded on the venerable practice of the East. According to his account, the recluses of Egypt were divided into three principal classes:—the Anchorets, the Cœnobites, and the Sarabaites. The two former, whose numbers were nearly equal, formed the respectable and genuine portion of the profession. The last were independent, and were regarded as spurious and unworthy brethren. The Anchorets occupied, either in perfect solitude or in very small societies, the rudest and most secluded recesses of the desert. 'We are not destitute of parental consolation, (said the Hermit Abraham to Cassian, who was beginning to sigh after the more agreeable solitudes of Asia and Europe,) nor devoid of means of easy sustenance—were we not bound by the command of our Saviour to forsake all and follow Him. We are able, if it seemed good, to build our cells on the banks of the Nile, instead of bringing our water on our heads from four miles' distance—were it not, that the Apostle has told us, that "every man shall receive his reward according to his labour." We know that in these our regions there are some secret and pleasant places, where fruits are abundant, and the beauty and fertility of the gardens would supply our necessities with the slightest toil—were it not that we fear "to receive in our lifetime our good things." Wherefore we scorn these things, and all the pleasures of this world; and we take delight in these horrors, and prefer the wildness of this desolation, before all that is fair and attractive, admitting no comparison between the luxuriance of the most exuberant soil and the bitterness of these sands*.'

The establishments of the Cœnobites, which were spread from one end of the country to the other, contained, severally, from one hundred to five thousand inhabitants. In some instances, the wall which confined them inclosed also their wells and gardens, and all that was necessary for their sustenance, so as to leave no pretext even for occasional intercourse with a world, which they had deserted for ever. The discipline to which they were subjected was rigid, but neither barbarous nor at all charged with injurious austerities. We read nothing of those chains and collars of iron, which formed a necessary part of self-devotion in the Syrian convents, nor is there any mention of sackcloth or flagellation, or any other voluntary torture. The whole severity of their practice consisted in abstemiousness; but even that was moderate; positive fasting was not encouraged; nor was it thought necessary to macerate the body in order to purify the soul. Bread and water was indeed the only nourishment allowed to the healthy devotee; but the bread was abundantly supplied; and those who have drawn from their infancy the sweet waters of the Nile

* Cassianus, Collationes, lib. xxiv. c. 2. Such passages are illustrated by other writers of the same, or nearly the same age. Among many others, the description of the Egyptian monks by Gregory Nazianzen (in Orat. xxi. *Εἰς τὸν Μίγαν Ἀθανάσιον*) is perhaps worth citing: *Οἱ πόρμου χωρίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς, καὶ τὴν ἔρημον ἀσπαζόμενοι ζῶσι Θεῷ πάντως μᾶλλον τῶν σωματικῶν τῷ σώματι. Οἱ μὲν τὸν παντὴ μοναδικὸν καὶ ἄμικτον διαβλύντες βίον ἑαυτοῖς μόνις προσλαλοῦντες καὶ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον κόσμον εἰδότες ἴσον ἐν τῇ ἡμερίᾳ γνωρίζουσιν· οἱ δὲ νόμον ἀγάπης τῇ κοινωνίᾳ στήροντες ἡρημικοὶ τε ἡμῶν καὶ μεγάλαις, τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐκδιδώσκουσιν ἀλλήλοις δὲ κόσμον ὄντες, καὶ τῇ παραίτεσι τὴν ἀρετὴν θέγουσι.* The same writer describes the character of a true monk with great minuteness and fervor in his XIIth Oration, (*Εἰς τὸν Εὐάστου τῶν Μοναζόντων*.)

seldom require or seek an artificial beverage. Neither was this rule enforced on all with indiscriminate rigour; but it was frequently modified according to age, or sex, or constitution.

They assembled to prayer twice in the twenty-four hours, at evening and during the night. Twelve psalms were chaunted, (the chaunt had been taught them by an angel,) each of which was followed by a prayer; and then two lessons were read from the Scripture to those who desired to be instructed in that volume. The hearers remained sitting during the greater part of the service, with very short interruptions of genuflexion or prostration. The signal which summoned them to prayer was a simple trumpet or horn; it was sufficient to break the silence of their deserts; and the hour of their night-prayer was indicated by the declining stars, which shine in that cloudless atmosphere with perpetual lustre. The offices of their worship were undisturbed by any sound of worldly care or irreverent levity. Their devotion, like their pyramids, was simple and solid, and they lived like strangers to the flesh and its attributes, like sojourners on earth and citizens of a spiritual community*.

Four objects were comprehended in their profession—solitude, manual labour, fasting, and prayer; and we cannot forbear to observe, how large a portion of their time was devoted to the second. Indeed, so strictly was the necessity of such occupation inculcated, that the moderation of their other duties might almost appear to have been prescribed with that view. A body, debilitated by the excess of fasting or discipline, would have been disqualified for the offices of industry which were performed by the monks of Egypt. Without any possessions, and holding it alike discreditable to beg or to accept†, they earned their daily bread by their skill and diligence in making mats or baskets, as cutlers, as fullers; or as weavers—inasmuch, that their houses may seem to have resembled religious manufactories, rather than places consecrated to holy purposes; and the motive of their establishment is liable to the suspicion of being, in some cases at least, worldly and political. Yet in the descriptions of their practice, both objects were so united, that the prayer seems to have been inseparable from the labour‡. To that end, the employments which they chose were easy and sedentary, so that the mind might be free to expatiate, while the hands were in exercise. At the same time, they maintained that perpetual occupation was the only effectual method to prevent distractions, and fix the soul on worthy considerations; that thus alone the tediousness of solitude, and its attendant evils, can be remedied; that the monk who works has only one demon to tempt him, while the monk unoccupied is harassed by demons innumerable§.

The Sarabaites|| are described by Cassian in language of violent and almost unmitigated censure. Yet if we neglect those expressions, which

* See Fleury's admirable Eighth Discourse.

† Cassian. Collat. xxiv. s. 11, 12, 13.

‡ Ita ut quid ex quo pendeat haud facile possit a quopiam discerni—i. e. utrum propter meditationem spiritalem incessabiliter manuum opus exerceant; an propter operis iugitatem tam præclarum profectum spiritus, scientiæque lumen acquirant. Cassian. Instit. lib. ii. c. 14.

§ Unde hæc est apud Ægyptum ab antiquis Patribus sancta (al. sancita) sententia—operantem Monachum dæmone uno pulsari; otiosum vero innumeris spiritibus devastari. Cassiani Instit. lib. x. c. 23. It appears from Cassian's preceding chapter, that any superfluity which the monks might have acquired was frequently employed in charitable purposes, and especially in the redemption of captives.

|| The same sect, no doubt, which St. Jerome calls Remoboth, and stigmatizes as 'genus deterrimum atque neglectum.' Epist. xviii. ad Eustochium. De Custodia Virginitatis.

become suspicious through their very rancour, and adhere only to the facts which are mentioned as characteristic of that monastic sect, it appears, that they were seceders, or at least independent, from the Cœnobitical establishments. They claimed the name of Monks; but without any emulation of their pursuits, or observance of their discipline. They were not subject to the direction of elders, nor did they strive, under traditional institutions, to subject their inclinations to any fixed or legitimate rule. If they publicly renounced the world, it was either to persevere, in their own houses, in their former occupations under the false assumption of the monastic name, or building cells, and calling them monasteries, to dwell there without any abandonment of their secular interests. They laboured indeed with industry at least as sedulous, as their more regular brethren—but they laboured for their own individual profit, not for that of an instituted community*. From this hostile account, it would appear that the Sarabaites, if they were spurious monks, were at least useful members of society; and the union which they established of the religious profession with worldly occupations, seems to have revived, or rather perpetuated, the leading principle of ascetism.

From Egypt, the popular institution was immediately introduced into Syria by a monk named Hilarion; but the Syrians appear *St. Basil.* soon to have deviated from the simplicity and moderation of their masters into a sterner practice of mortification, and even torture. From Syria, it was transmitted to Pontus and the shores of the Black Sea, and there it found a respectable patron, the most eminent among its primitive protectors, Basilus, Archbishop of Cæsarea.

That celebrated ecclesiastic—who was a native of Cappadocia, the brother of Gregory of Nyssa, and the fellow-disciple (as is asserted) of the then future apostate Julian—has given his name to the single order, which has subsisted in the Greek Church †, with scarcely any variation or addition, from that period to the present moment; and it is this circumstance, as well as his superior antiquity, which has established him as the most venerable of the patriarchs of Monachism. His claim to that reputation is said to consist in this—he united the Hermits and Cœnobites already established in his diocese; and to his monasteries, so formed, he prescribed a rule, which was rigidly observed by them, and imitated by others: by this bond, he gave them a consistency and uniformity, which had hitherto been peculiar to the institutions of Egypt ‡. Besides which,

* Cassian. Collat. xviii. c. 7. Cassian's dislike for the Sarabaites was probably contracted in the cells of the Cœnobites, who viewed with a sort of sectarian jealousy the industry and the profits of rebels or of rivals.

† It is true that certain heretical orders, Maronites, Jacobites, Nestorians, &c. professed to follow the rule of St. Anthony; but St. Anthony delivered, in fact, no rule. When solicited to impose some code upon his disciples, he is recorded to have presented to them the Bible—an eternal and universal rule. Hospin. lib. ii. c. 4.

‡ It does not, however, appear, that his rule was in the first instance very generally observed. At least we find, that as much as thirty years later, Cassian (Institut. lib. ii. c. 2.) contrasted the diversity, particularly respecting the times and nature of the holy offices, which prevailed elsewhere, with the uniformity of the more ancient institutions of Egypt. 'In hunc modum diversis in locis diversum canonem agnovimus institutum, totque propemodum typos et regulas vidimus usurpatas, quot etiam monasteria cellasque conspeximus. Sunt quibus.... Quapropter necessarium reor antiquissimam patrum proferre constitutionem quæ nunc usque per totam Egyptum a Dei famulis custoditur,' &c. It is, indeed, the opinion of Hospinian (though it does not seem sufficiently founded), that St. Basil's Cœnobita were little more than theological schools, and that his

he strongly recommended * the obligation of a vow, on admission to the monastic state—an obligation which, whether it were actually established by St. Basil or not, had certainly no existence before his time. These advancements in the system were effected from the years 360 to 370 ; and thus the plant, which had first been nourished by Anthony and Pachomius with imperfect, but not improvident culture, grew up, within the space of twenty years, into vigorous and lasting maturity.

It is a fact demanding observation, that the Fathers of the ancient Church, who flourished about this period, among whom were many eloquent and learned and pious men, were *Conduct of the* favourable, without one exception, to the establishment *ancient Fathers.* of monasticism: for though it might be beneath the office of reason to investigate the motives of the illiterate enthusiasts who began the work, it would be improper to pass over without comment the considerate labours of the ecclesiastics who completed it. Moreover, as they were apt enough to differ on some other points, in which the interests of religion were concerned, and as they delivered, on all occasions, their particular opinions with great boldness and independence, their unanimity in the introduction of one grand innovation is, by that circumstance, still further recommended to our attention. Yet must we hesitate to ascribe to them motives altogether unworthy. We should be wholly mistaken if we were to attribute their conspiracy to any deep design for the establishment of priestly rule, or the increase of the wealth and authority of the Church beyond their just limits. These evil consequences did, indeed, result from the work, and spread, with fatal influence, over the western world ; but they could not be contemplated by the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, because they rose and grew with the growth of *papal* usurpation, of which, in those days, there was no fear nor thought. It was the alliance between papacy and monasticism which tended more, perhaps, than any other cause, to elevate and magnify, and at the same time to vitiate, both. But the eye of Athanasius, or Chrysostom, or Augustin, could not possibly foresee that union, nor penetrate the various circumstances which afterwards concurred to aggrandize the Bishop of Rome. So far may we safely acquit even the most sagacious among the Fathers of monasticism ; and as far as the spirit of the age can be held to excuse those whom, in appearance, it carries along with it, but who, in fact, encourage and influence it, so far may the conduct of those mistaken men be excused. And perhaps we might add, in further palliation, that the general demoralization of society, over which Christian principles were still contending for predominance with the pernicious remnants of paganism, seemed to permit so little hope of righteous conduct to persons busied in the world, as almost to justify retreat and seclusion. We should, moreover, in attempting to account for this agreement, always bear in mind, that the early patrons of monasticism were, with very few exceptions, Orientals or Africans ; men of ardent temperament, and impetuous imagination ; among whom the theory of religion too frequently tended

rule was no other than the ordinary form of school discipline. Such, as he thinks, were the monasteries of those days. Lib. iii. c. 2. The Rule commonly ascribed to that saint may be found, in Latin, in the same place.

* Bingham, Ch. Antiq. book vii. The author of the *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques* expressly asserts, that as monasteries were instituted by Anthony, and congregations by Pachomius, so the three vows (of chastity, poverty, and obedience) were the introduction of St. Basil. It is, at least, certain, that the *duties* of obedience and poverty were early and very rigidly practised by the Eastern monks.

to mysticism, and its practice to mere sensible ceremony, and bodily mortification. We have no reason to believe that any worldly premium to the new philosophy was held out by the princes or nobles of those days; nor even that the influx of oblations from the vulgar was the immediate fruit of the profession of poverty*, as was elsewhere the case in later times. The monasteries of the East were at no period so overgrown with opulence as those of the Roman Church; and in their origin they certainly offered no imaginable temptations to avarice or sensuality. On these and similar considerations, we may acquit the original founders of the monastic system of those odious motives, with which they have sometimes been charged; but we must censure their encouragement of popular superstition; we must condemn that rash enthusiasm, which exceeded what is written; and we must pronounce those to have been insufficient guides to religious knowledge, who, at a crisis of such infinite importance, inculcated any other rule of life, than such as tended directly, through the plain and practical precepts of the Gospel, to the general welfare of mankind.

The earliest age of monachism differed in many particulars from those which matured and perfected the system. The vow of *Early form of Celibacy* was either not taken by the original monks, or *Monachism.* not universally enforced; though the practice was usual, and held indicative of a higher condition of sanctity. Community of property was indeed established among them; but that property was chiefly acquired by the labour of their hands. The necessity of manual industry, which was coeval with the institution, was subsequently enforced by St. Augustin, as the best safeguard against the snares of the Tempter; and the spiritual motives to strict moral demeanour were encouraged by the absolute poverty of the individuals. Mendicity, which had an early existence in the system, was stigmatized with immediate censure. It does not appear that the primitive monks were positively prohibited by any vow from returning, if they thought fit, to the turbulence of the world; though such desertions were strongly discouraged, as early as the Council of Chalcedon, both by ecclesiastical denunciations, and perpetual exclusion from holy orders. Several restrictions were imposed with respect to admission into the monastic order. Of husbands and wives, the mutual agreement was necessary for the seclusion of either; servants were not admitted, unless with the approbation of their masters, nor children without the consent of their parents and themselves. These and other reasonable impediments to the abuse of monachism were first weakened by the superstitious improvidence of Justinian.

The original monks were, without exception, laymen; but in situations, where the only accessible place of worship was within the walls, one priest was added to the society, and he generally filled the office of Abbot or Hegoumenos. St. Jerome† has expressly distinguished the monastic

* Not that even the earliest monks have escaped the reproaches of the contemporary Fathers. St. Jerome especially (Epist. xxxv., ad Heliodorum Monachum) notices the birth of corruption:—‘Alii nummum addant nummo, et marsupium suffocantes matronarum opes venenter obsequiis; sint ditiores Monachi, quam fuerant sæculares; possideant opes sub Christo paupere, quas sub locuplete Diabolo non habuerant; et suspiret eos Ecclesia divites, quos tenuit mundus ante mendicos.’ . . . But notwithstanding this and other particular passages, the general expressions used by those writers respecting the monastic condition, prove its general respectability.

† Epist. V., ad Heliodorum Monachum. ‘Alia Monachorum est causa; alia clericorum. Clerici pascunt oves; ego pascor. Illi de altario vivunt; mihi, quasi infructuosæ arbori, securis ponitur ad radicem, si munus ad altare non defero.’ . . . Mihi ante

from the sacerdotal order; and Leo I., in a communication to Maximus, bishop of Antioch, forbade monks to usurp the office of religious instruction, which was properly confined to the priests of the Lord. It is true, indeed, that, very early in monastic history, those establishments were considered as schools and nurseries for the ministry, and that persons were selected for ordination from among their inhabitants; but those so ordained immediately quitted the cloister, and engaged in the duties of the secular clergy; and in Greece they were distinguished by the title of Hieromonachoi, or Holy Monks*.

There is no doubt, that Orientals are naturally more prone to acts of fanaticism and ascetic austerities, than the more rational, and, at the same time, more sensual nations of Europe; and we might have expected to find the most extraordinary instances of self-inflicted torture among those who originated that practice, and whose habits and passions peculiarly prepared them for it. It is uncertain whether this be so; for though it be true that the madness of the Stylites gained no prevalence in the Western Church, and that the Boskol, or Grazing monks (an Asiatic order of the fifth century, which proposed to unite the soul to the Deity, by degrading the body to a condition below humanity) found no imitators in a more inclement climate; yet their mortifications and absurdities were rivalled, if not in the cells of the Benedictines, at least by the Flagellants, and some other heretics of the fourteenth century; and the discipline of the more rigid Franciscans was probably, in the early ages of that order, as severe as human nature could endure. But even among the regular orders of the Western Church, monastic austerity was carried, under particular circumstances, and in later times, to a more perfect refinement than it ever attained in the East. It is not difficult to account for this singularity. A variety of motives, and a complication of passions, entered into the monkish system of the Roman Church. Many were unquestionably actuated by superstition, many, perhaps, by purer sentiments of piety; but many more were impelled by personal ambition, by professional zeal, by the jealousy of rival orders, and, above all, by the thirst for that wealth, which so certainly followed the reputation of sanctity. On the other hand, the unvarying constitution, and the more tranquil character of the Eastern Church, presented fewer and feebler inducements to excessive severity. The passion which originally founded its monasteries, warm and earnest enthusiasm, continued still to animate and people them; but its ardour gradually abated; and the defect was not supplied in the same abundance, nor by the same sources, which sprang from the rock of St. Peter. From the earliest period, the Head of the Eastern Church was subject to the civil power, and he has always continued so; and thus, as he has at no time asserted any arrogant claims of temporal authority, nor engaged in any contests with the state, he possessed no personal

Character of Oriental Monachism.

Presbyterum sedere non licet,' &c. . . . Hospinian, (lib. iii., c. 13), under the head 'Monachi ab initio non Clerici,' adduces strong reason (in spite of some contradictory decrees) to believe that they were permitted to take orders as early as the time of Pope Siricius, in 390; and that all the privileges of the secular priesthood were subsequently conferred on monastic priests, and confirmed by Gregory the Great. Still, as they continued to be bound by their vows, they acquired the clerical, without losing the monastic, character.

* The foundation of an order of Canons, attributed to St. Augustin, (which will presently be mentioned,) was a distinct institution.

or official interest in the aggrandisement of the monastic order. Again, the two grand political revolutions of the Eastern and Western empires produced effects precisely opposite on the condition of monachism in either. The overthrow of the latter by the Pagans of the North, the early conversion of the conquerors, and the subsequent establishment of the feudal system, became the means of enriching the monasteries, from private as well as royal bounty, with vast territorial endowments. Whereas the possessions of the Oriental Church, which, through less favourable circumstances, had already been reduced to more moderate limits, were still further despoiled by the fatal triumph of the Turks.

The institution of nunneries was contemporary with that of monasteries, and is also attributed to St. Anthony; but the earliest accounts incline us to believe that it was not equally flourishing. In countries where sterility is common, and the population either scanty or fluctuating, the government would doubtless discourage the seclusion of females. We learn, too, that their houses were less carefully regulated, and their vows less strictly observed in Asia than in the West of Europe. Athens is mentioned as the nurse of several such establishments; but it was lamented that the ladies of rank and wealth were not easily prevailed upon to devote themselves to religious seclusion. Of a convent which was founded at Constantinople by the Empress Irene (in 1108), the constitutions still remain*. But the Nuns of St. Basil were more numerous and more prosperous in the West, than in the climate of their origin; and in Sicily especially, and the South of Italy, they arrived, in later ages, at considerable wealth and importance†.

The original monastic establishments of every description were subjected, without any exception, to the Bishop of the diocese. The exemptions from that authority, which were afterwards introduced, through the pernicious progress of papacy, into the Western Church, had little prevalence, as, indeed, they had no strong motive, in the East.

SECTION II.

Institution of Monachism in the West.

It is very generally asserted‡, that the monastic system was introduced into the West by Athanasius, during his compulsory sojourn at Rome, in 341. It is believed, that he carried in his train to the imperial city certain monks and anchorets, representatives of the Egyptian commonwealth, whose wild aspect and devout demeanour moved the reverence, and at the same time roused the emulation, of the Romans. Some monasteries were immediately founded; and many retired to lonely places for the exercise of solitary worship. From Rome, (if the above account be true,)

* *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, (Prem. Partie, Chap. xxviii.) By a regulation peculiarly oriental, it was herein ordained, that the steward, the confessor, and the two chaplains, the only males employed about the convent, should be eunuchs. We do not learn whether this precaution was usual in the nunneries of the East.

† Another class of religious females, called Virgins of the Church, had an early existence in the East. They continued to unite the discharge of their social duties with a strict profession of religious chastity—thus advancing one step beyond the *ascetism* of their forefathers.

‡ Baronius, (ann. 328), Mabillon, and Gibbon hold this opinion; but Muratori pretends that the first monasteries founded in Italy were erected at Milan. Mosheim more wisely pronounces the uncertainty of the fact.

the monastic practice was instantly diffused throughout Italy; and at Milan especially, it obtained a powerful support in the patronage of Ambrose. It speedily extended itself to France; and the labours of Martin of Tours, which were zealously directed to its diffusion, received at least this posthumous recompense, that nearly two thousand holy disciples assembled to do honour to his obsequies. The establishments, founded by Cassian at Marseilles, and in the neighbouring islands, were immediately thronged with brethren obedient to his Rule; and Honoratus, bishop of Arles, bears testimony (about the year 430) to the existence of 'religious old men in the isle of Lerinus, who lived in separate cells, and represented in Gaul the Fathers of Egypt*.'

We may here observe, that, as in the wide wildernesses of the East, a secluded rock, or an unfrequented oasis—a spot cut off by the circumfluous Nile, or breaking the influx of the river into the sea—as such were the places usually selected by the original recluses, so their earliest imitators in the West, under different circumstances of soil and climate, adhered to the ancient preference for insular retirement. The islands of Dalmatia†, and others scattered along the coasts of the Adriatic, were peopled with holy inhabitants. Along the western shores of Italy ‡,

* The following are some of the passages which bear on this subject. St. Jerome, speaking of the time of Athanasius's visit to Rome, says, (in Epist. 16, ad Principiam Virginem,) 'Nulla eo tempore nobilium fœminarum noverat Romæ propositum Monachorum, nec audebat, propter rei novitatem, ignominiosum (ut tunc putabatur) et vile in populis nomen assumere. Hæc (Marcella) ab Alexandrinis prius sacerdotibus Papaque Athanasio, et postea Petro, . . . vitam B. Antonii adhuc tunc viventis, Monasteriorumque in Thebaide Pachumii et Virginum ac Viduarum didicit disciplinam, nec erubuit profiteri quod Christo placere agnoverat.' Soon afterwards, when Jerome was at Rome, 'fuerunt tam crebra Virginum Monacharumque innumerabilis multitudo, ut pia frequentia serventium Deo, quod prius ignominia fuerat, esset postea gloria.' So also Augustin (De Morib. Eccles. c. 33) 'Romæ etiam plura Monasteria cognovit, in quibus singuli gravitate atque prudentia et divina scientia pollentes, cæteris secum habitantibus præerant Christiana caritate, sanctitate et libertate viventibus.' And the same Father (Confess., lib. viii. c. 6) attests, on the authority of one Pontitianus, that there existed at Milan 'Monasterium plenum bonis Fratribus, extra urbis mœnia sub Ambrosio nutritore.' Sulp. Severus mentions the success of St. Martin to have been so great, 'ut ad exequias ejus monachorum fere duo millia convenisse dicantur. Specialia Martini gloria, cujus exemplo in Domini servitute stirpe tanta fructificaverat.'

† Jerome, Epist. xxxv., ad Heliodorum. 'Quumque crederet quotidie aut ad Ægypti Monasteria pergere, aut Mesopotamiæ invisere choros, aut certe insularum Dalmatiæ solitudines occupare,' &c.

‡ See Marsham's *Προσωπλίον*, in Dugd. Monast. Respecting the monks of the isles of Gorgonia and Capraria, Rutilius Numatianus composed some verses, (in the year 416,) which have more of elegance (says Marsham) than of Christianity. The following are some of them:—

Processu pelagi jam se Capraria tollit;
Squallet lucifugis Insula plena viris.
Ipsi se Monachos Graio cognomine dicunt,
Quod soli nullo vivere teste volunt.
Munera fortunæ metuunt, dum damna verentur.
Quisquam sponte miser, ne miser-esse queat?
Sive suas repetunt ex fato ergastula pœnas;
Tristia seu nigro viscera felle tument.

* * * * *

Noster enim nuper Juvenis, majoribus amplis,
Nec censu inferior, conjugiove minor,
Impulsus furis homines Divosque relinquit,
Et turpem latebram credulus exul agit.
Infelix putat illuvie cœlestia pasci,
Seque premit cæcis sævior ipse Deis.
Num, rogo, deterior Circæis secta venenis?
Tunc mutabantur corpora, nunc animi.

Many

from Calabria, throughout the islets of the Tuscan Sea, the chaunts of monastic devotion everywhere resounded, as well as at Lerinus and the Strophades, consecrated by the piety of Cassian. Such, in the first instance, were the favourite nurseries of the new institution. There is even reason to believe, that the rocks on the southern coast of Italy furnished the seeds of monachism to the churches of Carthage; and thus was transmitted, after the revolution of half a century, to the more Western Africans, the boon which their brethren of Egypt had first presented to the Christian world.

It is, indeed, unquestionable, that towards the end of the fourth, but especially during the fifth century, the monastic practice obtained universal prevalence, and became almost co-extensive with the belief in Christ. And on this circumstance there is one observation which it is proper to offer, which has indeed been made before, though in a somewhat different spirit, by Roman Catholic writers—that the period, which was marked by this great religious innovation, was the same in which the religion itself seemed in imminent danger, at least throughout the Western provinces, of utter extirpation. This was the very crisis in which the pagan inundation from the North spread itself most fiercely and fatally, and while it overthrew the bulwarks of the empire, menaced, at the same time, the foundations of the Faith. That the monastic institution was designedly interposed by Providence, in order to stay that wasting calamity, and supply new means of defence to His fainting soldiers, is a vain and even a presumptuous supposition. But it would equally be unjust to assert, that establishments of pious men, associated for religious purposes, were without their use in exciting respect in the enemy, and confidence in the Christian. Still less can we hesitate to believe, that they were the means of relieving much individual misery; that during the overthrow of justice and humanity, they derived power, as well as protection, from the name of God, and from the trust which they reposed in him; that their power was generally exerted for good purposes; and that their gates were thrown open to multitudes, who, in those days of universal desolation, could hope for no other refuge.

The rule commonly professed by the original Western monasteries was unquestionably that of St. Basil; and though it was not observed with any rigid uniformity, there was probably no material variation either in constitution or discipline throughout the whole extent of Christendom, excepting such as naturally resulted from the different climate, morals, and temperament of its inhabitants. At least, there was no distinction in order or dignity: all were united by one common appellation, extending from the deserts of Pontus to the green valleys of Ireland; and the monks of those days were sufficiently separated from the rest of mankind, and sufficiently disengaged from secular pursuits, to dispense with the baser

Many other islands are mentioned as having been thus consecrated, (or desecrated—as the describer might be an ecclesiastical annalist, or a pagan poet). The island Barbara, situated above the conflux of the Rhone and the Arar, boasted to have been one of the most ancient nurseries of the Holy Institution; and Jerome, in an epistle to Heliodorus, speaks of ‘*Insulas et totum Etruscum mare Volscorumque provinciam, et reconditos curvorum littorum sinus, in quibus monachorum consistebant Chori.*’ . . . See Mabillon, Pref. in Ann. Bened. Sæc. i. Giannone’s View of the Origin of the Monastic Life in the West (Stor. di Nap., lib. ii., cap. 8.) does not appear to be marked by the accuracy and perspicuity usual to that excellent historian.

motives to which they were afterwards reduced, of partial interest and rivalry. Some wealth, indeed, began already to flow into that channel; but the still remaining prevalence of hermits, who dwelt among the mountains in unsocial and independent seclusion, very clearly proves, that the more attractive system of the Cœnobites had not hitherto attained any luxurious refinement. No large territorial endowments had yet been attached to religious houses, and their support was chiefly derived from individual charity or superstition. And during the course of the fifth century the progression of monachism was probably more popular, and certainly more profitable, among Eastern nations, than it had yet become on this side of the Adriatic.

But in the following age a more determined character was given to that profession. A hermit named Benedict, a native of Nursia in the diocese of Rome, instituted, *Benedict of Nursia*, about the year 529, an entirely new order, and imposed a rule, which is still extant, for its perpetual observance. . . No permanent and popular institution has ever yet existed, however in its abuse it have set sense and reason at defiance, which has not some pretension to virtue or wisdom, and usually much of the substance of both, in its origin and its infancy. It was thus with the order of St. Benedict. That celebrated rule, which in after ages enslaved the devout and demoralized the Church—which became a sign and a watchword for the satellites of Papacy—was designed for purposes which, at the time of its promulgation, might seem truly Christian. Its objects were to form a monastic body, which under a milder discipline should possess a more solid establishment and more regular manners, than such as then existed; and also to ensure for those, who should become members of it, a holy and peaceful life, so divided between prayer, and study, and labour, as to comprehend the practical duties of religious education. Such was the simple foundation, on which all the riches, and luxury, and power, and profligacy of the Benedictines have been unnaturally piled up—consequences, which were entirely unforeseen by him who founded, and by those who immediately embraced, and by those who first protected*, a pious and useful institution.

It is proper to confirm these observations by some account of what is, perhaps, the most celebrated monument of ecclesiastical antiquity. The Rule of St. Benedict † is introduced by a quadruple division of those who professed the monastic life. The first class was composed of the Cœnobites or Regular Monks; the second, of the Anchores or Hermits, to whom he assigns even superior perfection; the third, of the Sarabaites, whom he describes as living without any rule, either alone or in small societies, according to their inclination; the fourth, of Gyrovagi or Vagabonds, a dissolute and degraded body. His regulations for the divine offices were formed, in a great measure, on the practice already described of the Monks of Egypt. Two hours after midnight they were aroused to vigils, on which occasion twelve psalms were chaunted, and certain lessons from the Scriptures read or recited. At day-break the matins, a service little differing from the preceding, were performed;

* Gregory the Great was a zealous patron of this institution, and so approved the moderation of the rule, that he has not escaped the suspicion of being its author.

† It is given at length by Hospinian.—*De Origine Monachatus*, lib. iv. cap. v.

‡ See Mabillon, *Præf.* in sec. II. *Annal. Benedict.* and *Hist. des Ord. Monast.*

and the intervening space, which in winter was long and tedious, was employed in learning the Psalms by heart*, or in meditating on their sense, or in some other necessary study. But besides these and the other public services, the duty of private or mental prayer was recognized in the Institutions of St. Benedict, and regulations were imposed which, while they restricted its duration, proposed to purify and spiritualize its character.

To the duty of prayer the holy legislator added those of manual labour and reading. The summer's day was so divided, that seven hours were destined to the former occupation, and two at least to the latter†. And should it so happen, (he observes,) that his disciples be compelled to gather their harvests with their own hands, let not that be any matter of complaint with them; since it is then that they are indeed monks, when they live by their own handy-work, as did our fathers and the apostles. During the winter season the hours of labour were altered, but not abridged; and those of study seem to have been somewhat increased, at least during Lent. The sabbath[‡] was entirely devoted to reading and prayer. Those whose work was allotted at places too remote from the Monastery to admit of their return to the appointed services, bent their knees on the spot and repeated their prayers at the canonical hours. The description of labour was not left to the choice of the individual, but imposed by the Superior. Thus if any possessed any trade or craft, he could not exercise it, except by permission of the Abbot. If anything were sold, the whole value was carefully appropriated to the common fund; and it was further directed, that the price should be somewhat lower than that demanded by secular artizans for the same objects—'to the end that God might be glorified in all things.'

In respect to abstinence‡, the Rule of St. Benedict ordained not any of those pernicious austerities, which were sometimes practised by his followers. Notwithstanding the indulgence of a small quantity of wine to those whose imperfect nature might require it, it prescribed a system of rigid temperance, which among those original Cœnobites was well enforced by their poverty—but it contains no injunction of fasting or mortification. Those vain and superstitious practices, the fruits of mingled enthusiasm and indolence, scarcely gained any prevalence in the monasteries of the West, until increasing wealth dispensed with the necessity of daily labour. The monks slept in the same dormitory, in which a lamp was kept constantly burning, and strict silence was imposed: Even in the day, they spake rarely; and every expression partaking of levity, and calculated at all to disturb the seriousness of the community—every word that was irrelevant to its objects and uses—was absolutely prohibited within the convent walls. The Rule makes no mention of any

* In England the establishment of Monachism was contemporary with that of Christianity. 'Augustinus, Monasterii Regulis eruditus, instituit conversationem, quæ initio nascentis ecclesiæ fuit patribus nostris, quibus omnia erant communia—Monasterium fecit non longe a Doroverniensi Civitate, &c.' Bede, lib. i. c. xxii.

† It was ordained, that if any one were unable to read or meditate, some other occupation should be imposed on him. But as Latin, the language of religious study, was at that time the vulgar tongue, at least one great impediment to religious instruction, which was so powerful in after ages, did not then exist.

‡ In this matter St. Benedict relaxed from the rigour of the Eastern observance; but he did so with reluctance, regretting the necessary imperfection of a system, which he was compelled to accommodate to the gradually decreasing vigour of the human frame. Even Fleury (see his Eighth Discourse) does not disdain to combat this notion.

sort of recreation ; but it enjoins that, every evening after supper, while the brothers are still assembled, one among them shall read aloud passages from the Lives of the Saints, or some other book of edification.

As the Abbot was then chosen by the whole society without regard to any other consideration than personal merit, so in the government of the monastery he was bound to consult the senior brethren on lesser matters, and the whole body on the more important contingencies—it was ordained, however, that after he had taken such counsel, the final decision should rest entirely with himself. Obedience was the vow and obligation of the others.

The form prescribed for the reception of Novices was not such as to encourage a lukewarm candidate. In the first instance, he was compelled to stand for four or five days before the gates, supplicating only for admission. If he persevered, he was received first into the Chamber of Strangers—then into that of Novices. An ancient brother was then commissioned to examine his vocation, and explain to him how rude and difficult was the path to heaven. After a probation of two months the Rule was read to him ; again, after six other months ; and a third time, at the end of the year. If he still persisted, he was received, and made profession in the Oratory before the whole community. And we should remark, that that profession was confined to three subjects—perseverance in the monastic life ; correction of moral delinquencies ; and obedience*. Offences committed by the brethren were punished, according to their enormity, by censure, excommunication, or corporal inflictions ; expulsion was reserved for those deemed incorrigible. Nevertheless even then the gate was not closed against repentance ; and the repudiated member was re-admitted, on the promise of amendment, even for the third time. . . . Such in substance was the Rule of St. Benedict ; and even the very faint delineation here presented may suffice to give some insight into the real character of the original monasteries. Perhaps too it may serve to allay the bitterness, which we sometimes are too apt to entertain against the founders and advocates of the system, by showing, that though unscriptural in its principle and pernicious in its abuse, it was yet instituted not without some wisdom and foresight ; and was calculated to confer no inconsiderable blessings on those ages in which it first arose.

The monastery of Monte Cassino, which became afterwards so celebrated in Papal History, was the noblest, though not perhaps the earliest, monument *Progress of the Institution.* of St. Benedict's exertions. The moment was favourable to his undertaking ; and his name and his Rule were presently adopted and obeyed throughout the greater part of Italy. By St. Maur, his disciple and associate, an institution on the same principle was immediately† introduced into France, and became the fruitful parent of dependent establishments. Somewhat later in the same century, St. Columban propounded in Britain a rule resembling in many respects that of St. Benedict, but surpassing it in severity ; and it was propagated with some success on the Continent. But it is the opinion of the most learned writers, that the monasteries, which at first followed it, yielded

* All those ancient brothers were laymen. It does not appear that even St. Benedict himself held any rank in the clergy.

† About the year 542. It was destroyed by the Danes, but subsequently re-established about the year 934, by the Bishop of Limoges. A great number of abbeys presently grew up under its shadow.—*Histoire des Ordres Monastiques.*

after no long interval to the higher authority and more practicable precepts of the Nursian; whose genuine institution indeed was soon afterwards planted in the south of the island by the monk Augustine. At the same time the same system was spreading northward beyond the mountains of the Rhine; and though it may probably be true, that the 'Holy Rule' (*regula sancta*) was not universally received until the ninth century—until the practice had been vitiated by many corruptions—it is evident, that it obtained great prevalence long before that time, while it yet retained its original integrity; and it is equally clear, that its moral operation upon a lawless and bloodthirsty generation could not possibly be any other, than to restrain and to humanize.

During the greater part of the seventh and the beginning of the following age, frightful ravages were committed by the Lombards in Italy, and by the Danes in France and Britain, against which even the sanctity of the monastic profession furnished very insufficient protection. Throughout this period of devastation, while all other laws and establishments were overthrown, it was not probable that even those of St. Benedict should remain inviolate. The monastery of Monte Cassino was destroyed about fifty years after its foundation, and the holy spot remained desolate for almost a century and a half*. And though the respectable fugitives found an asylum at Rome, where the discipline was perpetuated in security, during that long period of persecution, others were less fortunate; and even in those which escaped destruction a more relaxed observance naturally gained ground, in the midst of universal licentiousness. Accordingly we learn, that, towards the end of the eighth century, the order of St. Benedict had so far degenerated from its pristine purity, that a thorough reform, if not an entire reconstruction, of the system was deemed necessary for the dignity and welfare of the Church.

The individual to whom this honourable office was destined, was also named Benedict; he was descended from a powerful Gothic family, and a native of Aniane in the diocese of Montpellier. Born about the year 750, he devoted his early life to religious austerities, exceeding not only the practice of his brethren, but the instruction of the founder. The Rule of St. Benedict was formed, in his opinion, for invalids and novices; and he strove to regulate his discipline after the sublimer models of Basil and Pachomius. Presently he was chosen to preside over his monastery; but in disgust, as is reported, at the inadequate practice of his subjects, he retired to Aniane, and there laid the foundation of a new and more rigid institution. The people revered his sanctity and crowded to his cell; the native nobles assisted him in the construction of a magnificent edifice; and endowments of land were soon conferred upon the humble Reformer of Aniane. Moreover, as he enhanced the fame of his austerities by the practice of charity and universal benevolence †, his venerable name deserved the celebrity which it so rapidly acquired. His Ascetic

* See Leo Ostiensis. Chron. Cassinens, lib. i. Gregory III. restored the monastery, and Zachary his successor granted to it (about the year 743) the privilege of exclusive dependence on the Bishop of Rome. But one blessing was still wanting to secure its prosperity—and that was happily supplied by the Abbot Desiderius in 1066. In exploring some ruins about the edifice, he discovered the body of St. Benedict! It is true that a pope was soon found to pronounce the genuineness of the relic. Nevertheless the fact was long and malevolently disputed by rival impostors.

† Besides the general mention of his profuse donations to the poor, it is particularly related respecting this Benedict, that whenever an estate was made over to him, he invariably emancipated all the serfs which he found on it. Act. SS. Benedict., tom. v.

disciples were eagerly sought after by other monasteries, as models and instruments for the restoration of discipline; and as the policy of Charlemagne concurred with the general inclination to improvement, the decaying system was restored and fortified by a bold and effectual reformation.

When Benedict of Aniane undertook to establish a system, he found it prudent to relax from that extreme austerity, which as a simple monk he had both professed and practised. As his youthful enthusiasm abated, he became gradually convinced, that the rule of the Nursian Hermit was as severe as the common infirmities of human nature could endure*. He was therefore contented to revive that Rule, or rather to enforce its observance; and the part which he peculiarly pressed on the practice of his disciples, was the obligation of manual labour. To the neglect of that essential portion of monastic discipline the successive corruptions of the system are with truth attributed; and the regulations, which were adopted by the Reformer of Aniane, were confirmed (In 817) by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle. From this epoch † we may date the renovation of the Benedictine Order; and though, even in that age, it was grown perhaps too rich to adhere very closely to its ancient observance, yet the sons whom it nourished may nevertheless be accounted, without any exaggeration of their merits, among the most industrious, the most learned, and the most pious of their own generation.

It is not our intention to trace the numberless branches ‡ which sprang from the stem of St. Benedict, and overshadowed the surface of Europe. But there are three at least among them, which, by their frequent mention in ecclesiastical history, demand a separate notice,—the Order of Cluni, the Cistercian Order, and that of the Chartreux. The monastery of Corbie, also of great renown, was founded by Charlemagne for the spiritual subjugation of Saxony; but it is no way distinguished from the regular Benedictine institutions, than by its greater celebrity.

During the ninth century, the rapid incursions of the Normans, and the downward progress of corruption, once more reduced the level of monastic sanctity; and a fresh *The Order of Cluni.* impulse became necessary to restore the excellence and save the reputation of the system. The method of reformation was, on this occasion, somewhat different from that previously adopted.

* The duty of silence was very generally enjoined in monastic institutions. In the Rule of 'The Brethren of the Holy Trinity,' established by Innocent III., we observe for instance—'Silentium observant semper in Ecclesia sua, semper in Refectorio, semper in Dormitorio,'—and even on the most necessary occasions for conversation the monks were instructed to speak remissa voce, humiliter, et honeste.—See Dugdale, vol. ii. p. 830.

† It would not appear that these changes very much influenced the condition of monachism in England. The three great reformations in that system which took place in our church were, (1) that of Archbishop Cuthbert, in the year 747; (2) that of Dunstan, in 965, promulgated in the Council of Winchester, on which occasion the general constitution, entitled,—*Regula Concordiæ Anglicæ Nationis*,—was for the first time prescribed. It was founded partly on the Rule of St. Benedict, partly on ancient customs. (3) That of Lanfranc, in 1075, authorised by the Council of London, and founded on the same principle as the second. . . . Mabillon, a zealous advocate and an acute critic, sufficiently shows from John the Deacon, (who wrote the *Life of Gregory the Great* in 875,) that the Rule of St. Benedict was received in England before the second of those reformations. Our allusions to the ecclesiastical history of England are thus rare and incidental, because that Church is intended, we believe, to form the subject of a separate work.

‡ Such as the Camaldulenses, Sylvestrini, Grandimontenses, Præmonstratenses, the Monks of Valombrosa, and a multitude of others.

A separate order was established, derived indeed immediately from the stock of St. Benedict, yet claiming, as it were, a specific distinction and character—it was the order of Cluni. It was founded about the year 900, in the district of Maçon, in Burgundy, by William, duke of Aquitaine; but the praise of perfecting it is rather due to the abbot, St. Odo. It commenced, as usual, by a strict imitation of ancient excellence, a rigid profession of poverty, of industry, and of piety; and it declined, according to the usual course of human institutions, through wealth, into indolence and luxury. In the space of about two centuries it fell into obscurity; and after the name of Peter the Venerable (the contemporary of St. Bernard), no eminent ecclesiastic is mentioned as having issued from its discipline. Besides the riches, which had rewarded and spoiled its original purity, another cause is mentioned as having contributed to its decline—the corruption of the simple Rule of St. Benedict, by the multiplication of vocal prayers, and the substitution of new offices and ceremonies for the manual labour of former days. The ill effect of that change was indeed admitted by the venerable Abbot in his answer to St. Bernard.

But in the mean time, during the long period of its prosperity, the order of Cluni had reached the highest point of honourable reputation; insomuch that during the eleventh century, a bishop of Ostia (the future Urban II.) being officially present at a council in Germany, suppressed in his signature his episcopal dignity, and thought that he adopted a prouder title, when he subscribed himself '*Monk of Cluni*, and Legate of Pope Gregory*.' Those two names were well associated; for it was indeed within the walls of Cluni, that Hildebrand fed his youthful spirit on those dreams of universal dominion, which he afterwards attempted to realize: it was there, too, that he may have meditated those vast crusading projects which were accomplished by Urban, his disciple. But however that may be, the cloister from which he had emerged to change the destinies of Christendom, and the discipline which had formed him (as some might think) to such generous enterprises, acquired a reflected splendour from his celebrity; and since the same institution was also praised for its zealous and active orthodoxy, and its devotion to the throne of St. Peter, shall we wonder that it flourished far and wide in power and opulence; and that it numbered, in the following age, above two thousand monasteries, which followed its appointed Rule and its adopted principles? Yet is there a sorrowful reflection which attends the spectacle of this prosperity. Through all the parade of wealth and dignity, we penetrate the melancholy truth, that the season of monastic virtue and monastic utility was passing by, if indeed it was not already passed irrevocably; and we remark how rapidly the close embrace of the pontifical power was converting to evil the rational principles and pious purposes of the original institution.

Howbeit, we do not read that any flagrant immoralities had yet disgraced the establishment of Cluni. Only it had attained a degree of sumptuous refinement very far removed from its first profession. This degeneracy furnished a reason for the creation of a new and rival community in its neighbourhood. The Cistercian order was founded in 1098 †,

* See Hist. Litter. de la France, Vie Urban II.

† Anno milleno, centeno, bis minus uno,
Pontifice Urbano, Francorum Rege Philippo,

and very soon received the pontifical confirmation. In its origin it successfully contrasted its laborious poverty and much show of Christian humility with the lordly opulence of Cluni; and in its progress, it pursued its predecessor through the accustomed circle of austerity, wealth, and corruption. This Institution was peculiarly favoured from its very foundation; since it possessed, among its earliest treasures, the virtues and celebrity of St. Bernard. One of the first of the Cistercian monks, that venerated ecclesiastic established, in 1115, the dependent abbey of Clairvaux, over which he long presided; and such was his success in propagating the Cistercian order, that he has sometimes been erroneously considered as its founder. The zeal of his pupils, aided by the authority of his fame, completed the work transmitted to them; and with so much eagerness were the monasteries of the Cîteaux filled and endowed, that, before the year 1250, that order yielded nothing, in the number and importance of its dependencies, to its rival of Cluni. Both spread with almost equal prevalence over every province in Christendom; and the colonies long continued to acknowledge the supremacy of the mother monastery. But the Cîteaux was less fortunate in the duration of its authority, and the union of its societies. About the year 1350, some confusion grew up amongst them, arising first from their corruptions, and next from the obstruction of all endeavours to reform them. At the end of that century, they were involved in the grand schism of the Catholic church, and thus became still further alienated from each other; till at length, about the year 1500, they broke up (first in Spain, and then in Tuscany and Lombardy) into separate and independent establishments.

St. Bruno, with a few companions, established a residence at the Chartreuse, in the summer of 1084: the usual duties of labour, temperance, and prayer were enjoined with more perhaps than the usual severity*. But this community did not immediately rise into any great eminence; it was long governed by Priors, subject to the bishop of Grenoble; and its founder died (in 1101) in a Calabrian monastery. Nearly fifty years after its foundation, its statutes were written by a Prior, named Guiguès†, who presided over it for eighteen years. By the faithful

Burgundis Odone duce et fundamina dante,

Sub Patre Roberto cœpit Cistercius Ordo.—Pagi, Vit. Urban II., sect. 73. The date of another celebrated Institution, which we have no space to notice, has been similarly (though less artificially) recorded:—

Anno milleno, centeno, bis quoque deno

Sub Patre Norberto Præmonstratensis viget Ordo.

Norbert was archbishop of Magdeburg; and in great repute with Innocent II. The site of the monastery was præmonstrated by a vision—hence the name. The rule was that of St. Augustine; the Brethren were confirmed by Calixtus II., under the designation of Canonici Regulares Exempti; and they spread to the extremities of the east and the west.—Hospin. lib. v. c. xii.

* The earliest Cistercians, under Alberic, who died in 1109, affected a rigid imitation of the Rule of St. Benedict. They refused all donations of churches and altars, oblations and tithes. It appeared not (they said) that in the ancient quadripartite division the Monasteries had any share—for this reason, that they had lands and cattle, whence they could live by work. They avoided cities and populous districts; but professed their willingness to accept the endowment of any remote or waste lands, or of vineyards, meadows, woods, waters (for mills and fishing), as well as horses and cattle. Their only addition to the old rule was that of lay brothers and hired servants.—Frères Convers Laïques.

† Fleury, H. E. l. 67, s. 58. From these statutes it appears, that from September to Easter the monks were allowed only one meal a day; that they drank no pure wine; that fish might not be purchased except for the sick; that no superfluous gold or silver was permitted at the service of the altar; that the use of medicine was discouraged; but

observance of those statutes, though in its commencement far outstripped by its Cistercian competitors, it gradually rose into honourable notoriety; and at length, about the year 1178, its rule was sanctioned by the approbation of Alexander III. From this event, its existence as a separate order in the church is properly to be dated; and henceforward it went forth from its wild and desolate birth-place, and spread its fruitful branches over the gardens and vineyards of Europe. The rise of the Chartreux gave fresh cause for emulation to their brethren of older establishment; and the rivalry thus excited and maintained by these repeated innovations, if it caused much professional jealousy and doubtless some personal animosity, furnished the only resource by which the monastic system could have been brought to preserve even the semblance of its original practice. Still it should be remarked, that these successive additions to the fraternity implied no contempt of the institutions of antiquity: they made no profession of novelty, or of any improvement upon pristine observances; on the contrary, the more modern orders all claimed, as they respectively started into existence, the authority and the name of St. Benedict. The monk of Cluni, the Cistercian, the Carthusian, were alike Benedictines; and the more rigid the reform which they severally boasted to introduce, and the nearer their approximation to the earliest practice, the better were their pretensions founded to a legitimate descent from the Western Patriarch.

The rules of the reformed orders invariably inculcated the performance of manual labour; and the neglect of that injunction invariably led to their corruption. But an alteration had been effected in the general constitution of the body, which alone precluded any faithful emulation of the immediate disciples of St. Benedict. As late as the eleventh age the monks were for the most part laymen; and they performed all the servile offices of the establishment with their own hands. But in the year 1040, St. John of Gualbert introduced into his monastery of Vallombrosa a distinction which was fatal to the integrity of former discipline. He divided those of his obedience into two classes—lay brethren and brethren of the choir; and while the spiritual and intellectual duties of the institution were more particularly enjoined to the latter, the whole bodily labour, whether domestic or agricultural, was imposed upon their lay associates*. Thenceforward the Monks (for the higher class began to appropriate that name) became entirely composed either of clerks, or of persons destined for holy orders; the religious offices were celebrated and chiefly attended by them; while the servant was commanded to repeat his *pater* without suspending his work, and presented with a chaplet for the numbering of the canonical hours. A reason was advanced for this change; and had not a much stronger been afforded by the inordinate accumulation of wealth, it might have seemed perhaps

that, to compensate for that prohibition, the monks were bled five times a year. It is proper to add, that during the same period they were permitted to shave only six times.

Some statutes of this order are given by Dugdale, *Monast.* vol. i. p. 951. Among them we observe a strict injunction to manual labour:—

Nunc lege, nunc ora, nunc cum fervore labora;
Sic erit hora brevis, et labor ille levis.

* In the *Ordres Monastiques*, p. iv. c. 18, two sorts of laymen are mentioned as living in French monasteries: (1) Such as gave themselves over as slaves to the establishment, and were called Oblats or *Donnés*. (2) Such as were recommended for support to monasteries of royal foundation by the king. But neither of these classes were, properly speaking, lay brethren.

not unsatisfactory. In earlier ages, Latin, the language of prayer, was also the vulgar tongue of all western Christians ; but as that grew into disuse, and became the object of study, instead of the vehicle of conversation, the greater part of the laity were unable to comprehend the offices of the church. Accordingly it was deemed necessary to distinguish between the educated and the wholly illiterate brethren ; and, in pursuance of the principle, which then prevailed, of confining all learning to the sacred profession, the former were raised to the enjoyment of leisure and authority, the latter condemned to ignorance and servitude. This distinction, being earlier than the foundation of the Cistercian, Carthusian, and all subsequent orders, was admitted at once into their original constitution ; and therefore, however closely they might affect to imitate the most ancient models, there existed, from the very commencement, one essential peculiarity, in which they deviated from it.

According to the oldest practice, every monastery was governed by an abbot, chosen by the monks from their own body, and ordained and instituted by the bishop of *Papal Exemptions*. the diocess. To the superintending authority of the same the abbot was also subject ; and thus abuses and contentions were readily repressed by the presence of a resident inspector. But when, in the progress of papal usurpation, those establishments were *exempted* from episcopal jurisdiction, and placed under the exclusive regulation of the Vatican, the facilities for corruption were multiplied ; and a number of evils were created, which escaped the observation or correction of a distant and indulgent master. At the same time, the effect of this connexion was to infuse an entirely new spirit into the monastic system. Avarice, and especially ambition, took the place of those pious motives which certainly predominated in earlier days. The inmates of the cloister were associated in the grand schemes of the pontifical policy ; they became its necessary and most obsequious instruments ; they were exalted by its success,—they were stained by its vices : and the successive reformations, which professed to renovate the declining fabric, were only vain attempts to restore its ancient character. They could at best only expect to repair its outward front, and replace the symbols of its former sanctity ; the spirit, by which it had been really blessed and consecrated, was already departed from it.

Great complaints respecting monastic corruption were uttered both at the Council of Paris in 1212, and at that of the Lateran, which met three years afterwards. But, though some vigorous attempts were, on both those occasions, made to repress it, the counteracting causes were too powerful ; and the evil continued to extend and become more poisonous during the times which followed. It is singular that, at the second of those councils, it was proclaimed as a great evil in the system, that new orders were too commonly established, and the forms of monasticism multiplied with a dangerous fertility. And therefore, 'lest their too great diversity should introduce confusion into the Church,' it was enacted that their future creation should be discouraged. This is considered by some Catholic writers to have been a provident regulation ; since the jealousy among the rival congregations had by this time degenerated from pious emulation (if it ever possessed that character) into a mere conflict of evil passions. But whatever may have been the policy of the statute, it was at least treated in the observance with such peculiar contempt, that the institution of the Mendicants, the boldest of all the innovations in the annals of monachism, took place almost immediately afterwards.

SECTION III.

Canons Regular and Secular.

The order of monks was originally so widely distinct from that of clerks, that there were seldom found more than one or two ecclesiastics in any ancient convent. But presently, in the growing prevalence of the monastic life, persons ordained, or destined to the sacred profession, formed societies on similar principles; and as they were bound, though with less severity, by certain fixed canons, they were called, in process of time, *Canonici* *. The bishop of the diocese was their abbot and president. It is recorded that St. Augustine set the example of living with his clergy in one society, with community of property, according to the canons of the church; but he prescribed to them no vow, nor any other statutes for their observance, except such instructions as are found in his 109th Epistle †. Nevertheless, above a hundred and fifty religious congregations have in succeeding ages professed his rule and claimed his parentage, and assumed, with such slight pretensions, the authority of his venerable name. The true origin of the order is a subject of much uncertainty. Onuphrius, in his letter to Platina, asserts that it was instituted by Gelasius at Rome, about 495 ‡, and that it passed thence into other churches; and Dugdale appears to acquiesce in this opinion. It is, moreover, certain, that Chrodegangus, Bishop of Metz, prescribed a rule, about the year 750, to the Canons of his own reformation; and that he made some efforts, though not perhaps very effectually, to extend it more widely. Still some are not persuaded that societies of clerks were subject to one specified form of discipline, till the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle §, under the direction of Louis le Debonnaire, confirmed and completed the previous enactments of Mayence (in 813), and imposed on them one general and perpetual rule.

The plausible principle on which the order of canons was founded, to withdraw from the contagion of the world those who had peculiarly devoted themselves to the service of God, was found insufficient to preserve them from degeneracy. A division was early introduced (in Germany, according to Trithemius, and in the year 977), by which the reformed were separated from the unreformed members of the community, in name as well as in deed. The former, from their return to the original rule, assumed the appellation of *Canons-Regular*; the latter, who adhered to the abuse, were termed, in contradistinction, *Canons-Secular*; and this sort of schism extended to other countries, and became permanent in many.

* The term Canon originally included not only all professors of the monastic life, but the very Hierodules and inferior officers of the Church. Mosheim (on the authority of Le Bœuf, *Mémoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, vol. i. p. 174.) asserts that it became peculiar to clerical monks (*Frates Dominici*) soon after the middle of the eighth century. But we should rather collect from the *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, that the distinction was not generally established till the eleventh age.

† It should be observed, that this epistle, which is cited by ecclesiastical writers as containing instructions for an institution of Canons, was in fact addressed to a convent of refractory nuns, who had quarrelled with their Abbess, and exhibited some unbecoming violence in the dispute.

‡ See Dugdale. *De Canonorum Ordinis Origine*. There may be found the Rule which St. Augustine is said to have prescribed.

§ The rule here published was borrowed, in many particulars, from that of St. Benedict. But the order still retained the name and banners of St. Augustine.—*Hist. des Ordres Monastiques*.

The discipline of the regular canons was more seriously enforced by Nicholas II. in the year 1059; and about eighty years later, Innocent II. subjected them to the additional obligation of a vow; for they seem hitherto to have been exempt from such profession. Nevertheless, in the course of the two following centuries, they once more relapsed into such abandoned licentiousness, as to require an entire reconstruction from Benedict XII. After that period, they rose into more consideration than in their earlier history they appear to have attained.

There were besides some other orders, both military and mendicant, which professed the rule, or rather the name, of St. Augustine—the Hospitalers, for instance, the Teutonic Knights, and the Hermits of St. Augustine. But they will be mentioned under those heads where we have thought it more convenient to place them, than to follow in this matter the perplexed method of the ‘Historian of the Monastic Orders.’

SECTION IV.

On the Military Orders.

We have thus shortly mentioned the three grand religious Orders, which have been diversified by so many names and rules, and regenerated by so many reforms; which began in austerity, and yet fell into the most shameless debauchery; which arose in piety, and passed into wicked and lying superstition; which originated in poverty, and finally fattened on the credulity of the faithful, so as to spread their solid territorial acquisitions from one end of Christendom to the other. Founded on the genuine monastic principle of devout seclusion, so venerable to the ignorant and the vulgar, they presently surpassed the secular clergy in the reputation of sanctity, and in popular influence. Thus were they soon recommended to the Bishop of Rome; and in his ambition to exalt himself above his brother prelates, he discovered an efficient and willing instrument in the regular establishments. At an early period, he granted them protection, and patronage, and property, with the means of augmenting it: presently, he accorded to certain monasteries exemption from the episcopal authority; and in process of time, he extended that privilege to almost all. Thus he gradually constituted himself sole visitor, legislator, and guardian of the numberless religious institutions which covered the Christian world. The monks repaid these services by the most implicit obedience—for obedience was that of their three vows which they continued to respect the longest—and to their aid and influence may generally be ascribed the triumphs of the pontiff in his disputes with the secular clergy. In his contests with the State, they were not less necessary to his cause; for, as his success in those struggles usually depended on the divisions which he was enabled to sow among the subjects of his enemy, and the strength of the party which he could thus create, so the monks, in every nation in Europe, were his most powerful agents for that purpose. And thus, when we consider the victory, which the spiritual sometimes obtained over the temporal power, as a mere triumph of opinion over arms and physical force, we do indeed, at the bottom, consider it rightly; but our surprise at the result is much diminished, when we reflect how extensive a control over men’s minds was everywhere possessed by the religious orders,—how fearlessly and unsparingly they exercised that control, and with what persevering zeal it was directed to the support and aggrandisement of papal power.

The Benedictines and Augustinians were the standing army of the

Vatican, and they fought its spiritual battles with constancy and success for nearly six centuries. The first addition which was made to them was that of the Military orders; and this proceeded not from any sense of the insufficiency of the veteran establishments, nor from any distrust in them, but from circumstances wholly independent of those or any such causes. They arose in the agitation of the crusades, and they were nourished by the sort of spirit which first created those expeditions, and then caught from them some additional fury.

The union of the military with the ecclesiastical character was become common, in spite of repeated prohibitions, among all ranks of the clergy. It was exercised by the vices of the feudal system; which had given them wealth in enviable profusion, but which provided by no sufficient laws or strength of government for the protection of that which it had bestowed—so that force was necessary to defend what had been lavished by superstition. The warlike habits which ecclesiastics seem really to have first acquired in the defence of their property, were presently carried forth by them into distant and offensive campaigns, and exhibited in voluntary feats of arms, to which loyalty did not oblige them, and for which loyalty itself furnished a very insufficient pretext. But these general excesses did not give birth to any distinct order professing to unite religious vows with the exercise of arms; and even the first of those, which did afterwards make such profession, was in its origin a pacific and charitable institution.

This was the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, or the Knights of the Hospital. About the year 1050, at the wish of some merchants of Amalfi trading with Syria, a Latin Church had been erected at Jerusalem, to which a hospital was presently added, with a chapel dedicated to the Baptist. When Godfrey de Bouillon took the city in 1099, he endowed the hospital: it then assumed the form of a new religious order, and immediately received confirmation from Rome, with a rule for its observance*. The revenues were soon found to exceed the necessities of the establishment; and it was then that the Grand Master changed its principle and design by the infusion of the military character.

The Knights of the Hospital were distinguished by three gradations. The first in dignity were the noble and military; the second were ecclesiastical, superintending the original objects of the institution; the third consisted of the 'Serving Brethren,' whose duties also were chiefly military. To the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, they added the obligations of charity, fasting, and penitence: and, whatsoever laxity they may have admitted in the observance of them, they unquestionably derived from that profession some real virtues which were not shared by the fanatics who surrounded them; and they softened the savage features of religious warfare with some faint shades of unwonted humanity. So long as their residence was Jerusalem, they retained the peaceful name of Hospitallers; but they were subsequently better known by the successive appellations of Knights of Rhodes and of Malta. Faithful at least to one of the objects of their institution, they valiantly defended the outworks of Christendom against the progress of the invading Mussulman, and never sullied their arms by the massacre of Pagans or heretics.

* The rule of the Hospitallers (as confirmed by Boniface) may be found in Dugdale's *Monasticon*, vol. ii. p. 493.

The Knights Templars received their name from their residence in the immediate neighbourhood of the Temple at Jerusalem. The foundations of this order were laid in the year 1118; and the rule, to which it was afterwards subjected, was from the pen of St. Bernard. This institution, both in its original purpose and prescribed duties, was exclusively military.—To extend the boundaries of Christendom, to preserve the internal tranquillity of Palestine, to secure the public roads from robbers and outlaws *, to protect the devout on their pilgrimage to the holy places—such were the peculiar offices of the Templar. They were discharged with fearlessness and rewarded by renown. Renown was followed by the most abundant opulence. Corruption came in its train; and on their final expulsion from Palestine, they carried back with them to Europe much of the wild unbridled license, which had been familiar to them in the East. But their unhappy fate, as it is connected with one of the most important periods in papal history, must be reserved for more particular mention in its proper place.

The Teutonic, or German Order, had its origin again in the offices of charity. During the siege of Acre, a hospital was erected for the reception of the sick and wounded. *The Teutonic Order.* This establishment survived the occasion which created it; and, to confirm its character and its permanency, it obtained a rule (in 1192) from Celestine III., and a place among the 'Orders Hospitable and Military.' On the termination of the Crusades, these knights returned to Germany †, where they enjoyed considerable possessions; and soon afterwards, by a deviation from the purpose of their institution, which might seem slight perhaps in a superstitious age, they turned their consecrated arms to the conversion of Prussia.

That country, and the contiguous Pomerania, had hitherto resisted the peaceful exertions of successive missionaries, and continued to worship the rude deities, and follow the barbarous manners, of antiquity. But where the language of persuasion had been employed in vain, the disciplined valour of the Teutonic Knights prevailed. It was recompensed by the conquest of two rich provinces; and the faith which was inflicted upon the vanquished in the rage of massacre, was perpetuated under the deliberate oppression of military government. This event took place about the year 1230; but in another generation, when the memory of its introduction was effaced, the religion really took root and flourished, by the sure and legitimate authority of its excellence and its truth. After that celebrated exploit, the Teutonic Order continued to subsist in great estimation with the Church; and this patronage was repaid with persevering fidelity, until at length, when they perceived the grand consummation approaching, the holy knights generally deserted that tottering fortress, and arrayed their rebellious host under the banners of Luther.

* An order, with a somewhat similar object, was founded in France about the year 1233, called the Order of the Glorious Virgin Mary. It was confined to young men of family, who associated themselves, under the title of Les Frères Joyeux, for the defence of the injured, and the preservation of public tranquillity. They took vows of obedience and conjugal chastity, and solemnly pledged themselves to the protection of widows and orphans.

† In the treaty between the empire and the popedom in 1230, we find that the interest of the three military orders were expressly stipulated for by the Pope; and also, that certain places were held in sequestration by Herman, Master of the Teutonic Order until the Emperor should have fulfilled his part of the engagement. Fleury, l. 79. s. 64.

SECTION V.

The Mendicant, or Preaching Orders.

UNTIL the end of the twelfth century the exertions of the Popes were almost entirely confined to the establishment of their own supremacy in the Church, and of their temporal authority over the State: and, through the faithful subservience of the two ancient orders, they had obtained surprising success in both undertakings. But the increasing light of the eleventh and twelfth ages, and the increasing deformities of the Church, brought into existence a number of heresies, occasioning dissensions, such as had not divided Christians since the Arian controversy. These moreover presented themselves not with one form, and one front, and one neck, but were scattered under a multitude of denominations, throughout all provinces, and among all ranks. The secular clergy, relaxed by habitual indolence and occasional immoralities, rather gave cause to this disaffection, than subdued it; and the regular orders, become sluggish from wealth and indulgence, wanted the activity, perhaps the zeal, which was required of them. To detect the latent error, to pursue it into its secret holds, to drag it forth and consign it to the minister of temporal vengeance, was an office beyond the energy of their luxuriousness; still less did they possess the talents and the learning to confute and confound it. Wherefore, as the experience of some centuries had now proved, that the existing orders, how often soever and completely reformed and reproduced, had an immediate tendency to subside again into degeneracy and decay, it seemed expedient to introduce some entirely different organization into the imperfect system.

The first notion of the new institution* was given by that body of ecclesiastics who were commissioned by Innocent III. *St. Dominic.* to convert the Albigeois; and among these the most distinguished was St. Dominic. . . That favourite champion of the Roman Church, the falsely-reputed inventor of inquisitorial torture, was a Spaniard of a noble family and of the order of Canons-Regular. In his spiritual campaigns (it were well had they been no more than spiritual) against the heretics of Languedoc, he became eminent by an eloquence which always inflamed and sometimes persuaded; and having felt the power of that faculty, which through the space of thirteen centuries had so rarely revisited the Roman empire, he became desirous to establish a fraternity devoted to its exercise. His project was not discouraged by Innocent III.; but that pontiff hesitated to give the formal sanction necessary to constitute a new order: since the Council of Lateran, acting according to his discretion, had pronounced it generally expedient to reform existing institutions, rather than to augment their number. But immediately after the death of that Pope, Dominic was established in the privileges of a 'Founder,' by the bull of Honorius III †.

* Hospinian's Sixth Book comprehends a quantity of valuable matter on the subject of the Mendicants; and chapters iv. v. and vi. should particularly be consulted. The author is laborious and learned, but not impartial. In the zeal of the Protestant he has forgotten the moderation of the Historian, and (might we not sometimes add) the charity of the Christian.

† Fleury asserts, that the Frères Prêcheurs at first were not so much a new order, as a new congregation of the Canons-Regular; since it was only at a Chapter general held in 1220, that St. Dominic and his disciples embraced entire poverty and mendicity. This may be so—but at any rate their original condition was so extremely transient and destitute of all effects and characteristics, as to be wholly insignificant in history

Contemporary with St. Dominic was his great compeer in ecclesiastical celebrity, the father of the rival institution. St. Francis was a native of Asisi in Umbria, without rank, without *St. Francis*. letters, but of an ardent and enthusiastic temperament.

It is asserted—perhaps untruly—that his earlier age was consumed in profligacy, from which he was awakened by an opportune sickness, occasioned by his vices; and that his fears suddenly impelled him into the opposite extreme of superstitious * austerities. It is certain, that, as he inculcated, by his preaching, so he recommended by his example, the utmost rigour of the primitive monastic principle, — ‘that there was no safe path to heaven, unless by the destitution of all earthly possessions.’ Popularity was the first reward of his humiliation: he was soon followed by a crowd of imitators; and the motive, which probably was pure fanaticism in himself, might be want, or vanity, or even avarice †, in his disciples. Howbeit they readily acquired an extensive reputation for sanctity; and in the year 1210 the formal protection of Innocent was vouchsafed to the new order.

It appears probable that the foundation of the Franciscan Order was laid in poverty only—not merely unaccompanied by any obligation of a missionary or predicationary character, but likewise free from the vow of mendicity. St. Francis himself, in the ‘Testament’ which he left for the instruction of his followers, enjoined manual labour in preference to beggary; though he permitted them, in case of great distress, to have recourse to the table of the Lord, begging alms from door to door ‡. It should be mentioned, too, that he at the same time prohibited them from applying to the Pope for any privilege whatever. But the sophistical and contentious spirit of the age precluded that simplicity. And their founder was scarcely consigned to the grave, when his disciples obtained from Gregory IX. § a bull, which released them from the observance of his Testament, and placed an arbitrary interpretation on many particulars of his rule. It was thus that the necessity of labour was superseded, and honour and sanctity were preposterously attached to the profession of mendicity.

* The story of the Stigmata, or wounds of Christ, miraculously impressed upon his body, is known to all. The text on which this importance was founded (for it pleaded a text) was *Epist. Galat. end.* ‘From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.’ We read in Semler, *ann. 1222*, that a rustic, who made the same experiment on human credulity at about the same time, was imprisoned for life—*felicius cessit Francisco, sec. xiii. cap. iii.*

† Giannone, an impartial writer, thus begins a section (*lib. xix. cap. v. sec. v.*) entitled ‘*Monaci e Beni Temporalis.*’ ‘Henceforward we shall place together the subjects of “Monks” and “Temporalities;” since, as we have already observed, that he who pronounces “Monachism” (Religione,) pronounces “Riches,” so the Monks were now become incomparably more expert in the acquisition of wealth, than all the other ecclesiastics; and the monasteries in these days reaped profits to which those made by the Churches bore no proportion—so that the expressions “*New Religions*” and “*New Riches*,” became, properly speaking, synonymous. And this was the more monstrous, because it was in despite of their foundation in mendicity, (whence they had the name of *Mendicants*,) that their acquisitions and treasures were enormous.—*Polit. Eccles. del decimo terzo secolo.*

‡ Fleury, *Dissertat. 8me.* St. Francis designated his disciples by the name *Fraterculi*—Little Brothers—and this became, in different languages, *Fraticelli*, *Fratres Minores*, *Frères Mineurs*, *Friars Minors*.

§ This Pope was at the same time a great patron of the rival order. In 1231 he wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Sorrento, in order to introduce the Dominicans to his patronage, in these terms:—‘*Dilectos Filios Fratres Ordinis Predicatorum velut novos Vinitores sue vinee suscitavit; qui, non sua sed quæ sunt Jesu Christi quærentes, tam contra profigandas hæreses, quam pestes alias mortiferas extirpandas se dedicârunt evangelizationi Verbi Dei, in abiectione voluntariæ paupertatis.*’ The passage is cited by Giannone.

Here then we observe the first point of distinction in the first constitution of the two orders. The Dominicans were, in their earliest character, a society of itinerant preachers—this was the whole of their profession—they were not bound, as it would seem, by any vow of poverty. But after a short space, when their founder had possibly observed that the Franciscans prospered well under that vow—that without possessing any thing they abounded with many things*—he thought it desirable to imitate such profitable self-denial: accordingly, he also imposed upon his disciples the obligation of poverty.

Again: when the Franciscans discovered that no little influence accrued to their rivals from the office of public preaching, they also betook themselves to that practice; and, perhaps, with almost equal success. Thus it came to pass, that, after a very few years, two orders, essentially different in their original, were very nearly assimilated in character, and even in profession, and entered upon the same career with almost the same objects and the same principles.

Nevertheless, in the features of their policy and the character of their ecclesiastical influence, they continued to be distinguished by many important diversities. The whole course of their history is more or less strongly marked by these. And if many of them were occasioned (as is unquestionably true) by the passionate jealousy which they bore to each other, and which they displayed upon all occasions, to the great scandal and injury of the Church, it is equally certain, that the difference in their first constitution ever contributed to cause a difference in their destinies. The original vow and rule of St. Francis was at no time perfectly erased from the memory of his followers. Attempts were soon made to revive it in its native austerity; and thus, in addition to the general contention with the rival order, the most violent intestine dissensions were introduced into the family of that Saint, which terminated in permanent alienation and schism.

Again: another evil was brought upon the Church by these disputes—sharpened as they also were by the scholastic subtleties which in those days perverted reason. The authority of the Pope interposed to set them at rest, but his interference produced the opposite effect†: it not only increased the animosity of both parties, but also raised up a powerful branch of the fraternity in avowed opposition to the pontifical supremacy. In the controversy in which these 'indocile' brethren engaged during the fourteenth age, against John XXII., they proceeded so far in rebellious audacity as formally to pass the sentence of heresy upon the Vicar of Christ, and to abet the efforts of Lewis of Bavaria to depose him! Such (as Fleury has observed) was the termination of their humility—the deposition of a pope! Owing to these internal contests, it has even been made a question with some, whether the institution of the Mendicants has not contributed, upon the whole, to the decline, rather than the advancement of the papal interests. But there is not sufficient reason for such a doubt. The wound which the Roman See may have received from the passionate insubordination of a faction of one of those orders, bears no comparison with the benefits which it has derived from the

* We read, in the '*Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*,' of Franciscan *monasteries* of very early foundation—residences inconsistent with the perpetual practice of beggary. But those mansions were probably the first profits of the trade, the first-fruits of the violation of the vow.

† The good and simple pope, St. Celestine, sanctioned the division among the Franciscans by establishing the congregation of the 'Poor Hermits.'

faithful assiduity, the learning, the zeal, and the uncompromising devotedness of the other.

If the Dominicans surpassed the rival order in obedience to their common master, they also afforded a better example of internal harmony and discipline. Indeed, as they adhered very closely to the original object of their institution, the destruction of heresy, there was little reason why they should dispute with each other, and the strongest motive for concord with the Holy See. The destruction of heresy they were willing (as we have observed), in the first instance, to accomplish by the sword of the spirit; but, whether through the natural impatience of bigotry, or because the wisest among them began to suspect the weakness of their own cause, the futility of their sophistry, and the falsehood of their positions, after a very short attempt they abandoned *that* method of conversion, and betook themselves to the material weapon. The secular arm was summoned to their aid, and it became in process of time their favourite, if not their only, instrument.

Nevertheless those are in error who attribute the foundation of the Inquisition, as a fixed and permanent tribunal, to the hand of St. Dominic. It may seem indeed to have been the necessary consequence of his labours, the result to which his principles infallibly tended; and it is true that the administration of its offices was principally delegated to his order. But it was not anywhere formally established until ten or twelve years after his death*. In the mean time, the Dominicans, already trained to the chase, and heated by the scent of blood, eagerly executed the trust which was assigned to them. Over the whole surface of the western world they spread themselves in fierce and keen pursuit; and the distant kingdoms of Spain and Poland were presently infested with the same deadly visitation. Rome was the centre of persecution; the heart, to which the circulating poison continually returned—and whence it derived, as it flowed onward, a fresh and perennial supply of virulence and malignity.

The Dominicans, soon after their institution, seem to have appropriated most of the learning, then so sparingly distributed among the monastic orders. *Dispute of the Dominicans with the University of Paris.* They applied themselves chiefly to the science of controversy, and soon

became very formidable in that field—the more so, since they employed the resources of scholastic ingenuity in the defence of the papal government. The means and the end harmonized well; the prejudices of the age were to a great extent favourable to both; the exertions of reviving reason were perpetually baffled, and her friends discomfited and overthrown. . . . We shall briefly notice one signal campaign of the Dominicans—that which they carried on for above thirty years against the University of Paris. . . . That body, which was already the most eminent in Europe, thought it expedient, in the year 1228, to confine the Dominicans, in common with all other religious orders, to the possession of one of its theological classes, while those Mendicants warmly asserted their claim to two. Many violent contentions arose from this difference, and continued till the year 1255, with no decisive result: the matter was then referred to the wisdom of Pope Alexander IV. It is not difficult to anticipate the response of the Vatican. The University received an unqualified injunction to throw open to the Dominicans, not two classes

only, but as many chairs and dignities as it might seem good to them to occupy. For four years the refractory doctors resisted the execution of the sentence with a boldness worthy of a better age and a happier result. At length, terrified by the repeated menaces of the pontiff, they submitted. . . Nevertheless, the struggle had not been without its benefit. During the course of a protracted controversy, subjects had been handled of higher and more general importance, than the right of lecturing in the schools of Paris. While the discipline and principles of the Mendicants were examined and assailed, the power which upheld them did not escape from public reprehension. The possibility of error *even in the Church itself* was openly maintained; and the spirit of learning, which had hitherto ministered to ecclesiastical oppression, was at length aroused against it. The first efforts of the best principles are generally baffled and disappointed; but the example which they leave does not perish; but only waits till the concurrence of happier circumstances may bring the season for more successful imitation.

In the conduct of this dispute, as both parties became equally heated, the limits of reason were exceeded, with almost equal temerity, by both. Among many laborious productions, perhaps the most celebrated was that published by Guillaume de St. Amour, a doctor of Sorbon, and a powerful champion of the University, 'Concerning the Perils of the Latter Times.' The peculiarity which has recommended it to our notice is this. It was founded on the belief that the passage of St. Paul relating to 'the perilous times which were to come in the last days,' was fulfilled by the establishment of the Mendicants! . . . Every age has affixed its own interpretation to that text, and all have been successively deceived; and this might teach us some caution in wresting the mysterious oracles of God from their eternal destination to serve the partial views—to aid the transient, and perhaps passionate, purposes of the moment. Yet is there an undue value almost indissolubly attached, even by the calmest minds, to passing occurrences: however trivial and fugitive their character, they are magnified by close inspection, so as to exceed the mightiest events farther removed in time; and it is this, our almost insuperable inability to reduce present occurrences to their real dimensions—to place them at a distance, and examine them side by side along with the transactions of former days—to consider them, in short, disinterestedly and *historically*—it is this cause which has begotten, and which still begets, many foolish opinions in minds not destitute of reason; and which, among other fruits, has so frequently reproduced, and in so many shapes, the pitiable enthusiasm of the Millenarians.

Though both Dominicans and Franciscans professed to be at the same time mendicants and preachers, yet, in some sort of conformity with their original rules, the former continued to retain more of the predicator, the latter more of the mendicant, character. These last were consequently less distinguished by their literary contests, than by those which they waged against each other, respecting the just interpretation of the rule of their founder. In all other monastic institutions, the possession of property was forbidden to individuals, but permitted to the community; whereas the more rigid injunction of St. Francis denied every description of fixed revenues, even to the Societies of his followers. There were many among those who wished for a relaxation of this rule; and they obtained it without difficulty, both from Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. But another party, who called themselves the Spirituals, insisted on a strict

adhesion to the original institution; they even refused to share the glorious title of Franciscan with those who had abandoned it. This feeling displayed itself with particular vehemence in the year 1247, when John of Parma, a rigid spiritualist, was chosen general of the order. But the more worldly brethren still adhered to their mitigated discipline; and their perseverance, which was favoured, perhaps, by the secret wishes of many of the opposite party, received the steady and zealous concurrence of the Holy See. For whatsoever value the popes might attach to the voluntary poverty of their myrmidons,—to the respect which it excited, and the spontaneous generosity which so abundantly relieved it,—they no doubt considered, that it was more important to the permanent interests of the Church to encourage the increase of her fixed and solid and perpetual possessions.

The success of the Dominicans and Franciscans encouraged the profession of beggary; and the face of Christendom was suddenly darkened by a swarm of holy mendicants, in such manner that, about the year 1272, Gregory X. endeavoured to arrest the overgrowing evil. To this end he suppressed a great multitude of those authorized vagrants, and distributed the remainder, still very numerous, into four societies,—the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Hermits of St. Augustine.

The order of the Carmelites was, in its origin, Oriental and Eremitical. John Phocas, a monk of Patmos, who visited the Holy Places in 1185, thus concludes the narrative of *The Carmelites*. his pilgrimage:—‘On Mount Carmel is the cavern of Elias, where a large monastery once stood, as the remains of buildings attest; but it has been ruined by time and hostile incursions. Some years ago a hoary-headed monk, who was also a priest, came from Calabria, and established himself in this place, by the revelation of the Prophet Elias. He made a little inclosure in the ruins of the monastery, and constructed there a tower and a small church, and assembled about ten brothers, with whom he still inhabits that holy place*.’ Such appears to be the earliest authentic record of the foundation of the Carmelites. About the year 1209, Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, gave them a rule. It consisted of sixteen articles, which contain nothing original, and are merely sufficient to prove the ignorance, the abstinence, and the poverty of the original brothers. The institution was not, however, legitimately introduced into the grand monastic family till the year 1226, when it received the sanction of Honorius III. Twelve years afterwards it was raised from among the regular orders to the more valuable privileges and profits of mendicity; and we observe that the severe rule of its infancy was *interpreted* and mitigated soon afterwards by Innocent IV. Accordingly it became venerable and popular, and was embraced with the accustomed eagerness in every country in Europe.

A great number of individuals were still found scattered throughout the western Church, who cherished the name, though they might dispense with the severer *Hermits of St. Augustine*. duties, of hermits; and they professed a variety of rules by which their several independent societies were governed. Innocent IV. expressed his desire to unite them into one order; and it was executed by his successor. Alexander IV., the better to withdraw them from their seclusion, and engage them in the functions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy†, formed them into a single congregation, under one

* We cite the passage from Fleury, lib. lxxvi., sec. 55.

† Giannone, Stor. Nap., lib. xxi., cap. v., sec. 5.

rule and one general, and associated them by the same title of 'Hermits of St. Augustine.' We may observe, however, that as they were the most modern, so they were the least considerable of the mendicant institutions.

To these four orders the pontiffs granted the exclusive indulgence of travelling through all countries, of conversing with persons of all ranks, and instructing, wheresoever they sojourned, the young and the ignorant. This commission was presently extended to preaching in the churches, and administering the holy sacraments. And so great veneration did they excite by the sanctity of their appearance, the austerity of their life, and the authoritative humility of their manners, that the people rushed in multitudes to listen to their eloquence, and to crave their benediction. And thus the spirit of sacerdotal despotism, which had been chilled through the indecency or negligence of the secular clergy, and the luxurious languor of the regular establishments, was for a season revived and restored to an authority, in its extent more ample, and in its exercise far more unsparring, than it had possessed at any preceding period.

In their early years, the two great nurseries of the Dominicans were Paris and Bologna. In those cities, Jourdain, the General of the order,

and successor of its founder, alternately passed the season of Lent; and thence he sent forth his emissaries through the south and the west. Among the first converts

to the discipline of St. Dominic were many distinguished by rank and dignity, many eminent ecclesiastics, many learned doctors, both in law and theology, and many young students of noble parentage. Nor is it hard to believe those accounts, which praise the rigour of their moral excellence, and the general subjection of their carnal appetites to the control of the spirit. The very enthusiasm, which at first inflamed them for the purity and beauty of their institution, was inconsistent with hypocritical pretensions to piety; it tended, too, somewhat to prolong the exercise of those virtues whence it drew its origin. And thus, if their literary exertions were really stimulated by the highest motives—the glory of God, and the salvation of the faithful—they may well have surpassed the languid labours of the old ecclesiastics, which were so commonly directed to mere vulgar and temporal objects. Accordingly, as the Mendicants rose, the ancient orders and the secular clergy fell into disrepute and contempt; and the chairs and the pulpits, which they had so long filled, were, in a great measure, usurped by more zealous, more laborious, and more popular competitors.

But these conquests were not obtained or preserved without many violent and obstinate contests *. Both regulars and seculars defended their ancient privileges with an ardour which seemed to supply the want of

* The grand dispute in England between the Clergy and the Mendicants, in which the Archbishop of Armagh was so prominent, took place about 1357. The great complaint at that time was, that the latter had seduced all the young men at the University to confess to them, to enter their order, and to remain there. And the prelate mentions the remarkable fact, that, through the suspicions thus infused into families, the number of students at Oxford had been reduced during his time from thirty thousand to six thousand. It was made another matter of reproach on the mendicants, that they had bought up all the books, and collected in every convent a large and fine library. The field of contest was transferred to the pontifical court (then at Avignon); the mendicants were triumphant, and the Archbishop's mission appears to have had no result. And about the same time two considerable princes, Peter, Infant of Aragon, and Charles, Count of Anjou, became members respectively of the Franciscan and Dominican orders.

strength. Their disputes with each other were for the season laid aside; they united with equal earnestness against the invader of their common interests; and the rancour thus occasioned, and shared, in some degree, even by the most obscure individuals of both parties, was far from favourable either to the purity of religion, or to the honour of the Church—insomuch, that some Roman Catholic writers have expressed a reasonable doubt, whether the interests of their Church would not have been more effectually consulted by a thorough reformation of the two classes already consecrated to religion, than by the establishment of a new order. It is certainly true, that no cause has more scandalized the name of Christ, in every age of his faith, than the bitter dissensions of his ministers. Their very immoralities have scarcely been more poisonous in their influence on the people, than the spectacle of their jealousy and rancour. And thus, if the ancient zeal and piety could have been revived by ordinary regulations among the ecclesiastics of the thirteenth century—had it been possible to infuse into the decrepit the vigour of the young, into the pampered the virtue of the poor,—such had, indeed, been the safer method of regeneration. It appears, however, very questionable, whether the popes had power to accomplish so substantial a reformation in the Church, even had they been seriously bent on it. It is perfectly certain that they were not so disposed. The interests of papacy were now becoming widely different from the interests of the Church, and their policy (though they might not themselves be conscious of the distinction) was steadily directed to the former. With *that* view, the institution of the Mendicants was eminently useful, as it communicated a sort of ubiquity to the pontifical Chair. Moreover, the scandals which it occasioned were, in some measure, compensated by the energy to which the old establishments were reluctantly awakened; and which had been more honourable to themselves, and more useful to religion, had it been excited by a less equivocal motive.

One essential characteristic of the Mendicants was the want of any permanent residence; and thus their influence over the people, though at seasons vast and overruling, could not be deeply fixed, or very durable. Again, since they professed absolute poverty, they could scarcely exercise any fearless control over those, on whose favour and charity they were dependent for their daily subsistence: so that their popular authority was destitute of those substantial supports which their opponents derived from the possession of opulent establishments, and rested wholly on their talents and their virtues. As long as their zeal and their eloquence far surpassed those of the ancient ecclesiastics,—as long as the sanctity of their moral practice was beyond reproach or suspicion,—so long they deserved and maintained the superiority of their influence. But though the impression thus produced will generally last somewhat longer than the excellence which produces it, still the solid foundation of their power decayed with the decay of their original qualities; and the wealth which they at length substituted in the place of these, reduced them at best to the level of their rivals.

And no long time elapsed from their origin, before the reproach of corruption was commonly and justly cast upon them*. General complaints

* The evidence of Matthew Paris, an established Benedictine of St. Alban's, may be somewhat coloured by professional jealousy, but nevertheless it is substantially true. In his Henry III., anno 1246, he mentions, how, from being preachers, they became confessors, and usurped the other offices of the Ordinary. In the same place he publishes a celebrated Bull of Gregory IX. in their favour, and strongly describes the insolence which

arose respecting the multitude of pretexts which they invented for the extortion of money; respecting the vagabond habits, the idleness, and importunity of many among them. It was particularly asserted, that, having insinuated themselves into the confidence of families, they took under their special charge the management of wills, and constructed them to their own advantage. They became perpetual attendants on the death-bed of the rich. Moreover, they engaged with intriguing activity in the political transactions of the day, and were entrusted with the conduct of difficult negotiations. The cabinets of princes were not too lofty for their ambition, the secrets of domestic life were not beneath their avarice. Again—it offended the reason of many, that holy persons, professing profound humility and perfect poverty, should appear in the character of magistrates, having apparitors and familiars at their disposal, and all the treasures and all the tortures of the Inquisition. They thus became rich, indeed, and they became powerful: but there were those who did not fail to contrast the contempt of worldly glory, which illustrated the birth of their order, with the pomp which they afterwards assumed so willingly; and to remark, that through the abandonment of every possession, they possessed everything, and were more opulent in their poverty than the most opulent*. . . . Such reflections were obvious to the most illiterate; and they gradually diminished a popularity, which was ill compensated by riches. Howbeit, amid the decline in their reputation and the degeneracy of their principles, from the one grand rule of their ecclesiastical policy they never deviated,—they persevered, without any important interruption, in their faithful ministry to the Vatican. But from the time that they parted with their original characteristics, their agency became less useful; and the extravagance with which they sometimes exalted the pretensions of the See, began, in later ages, to excite some disgust among its more moderate and reasonable supporters.

they derived from it. ‘*Ecclesiarum rectores . . . procaciter alloquentes, indulta sibi talia privilegia in propatulo demonstrantes, erecta cervice ea exigentes recitari, &c.*’ . . . He then relates the manner in which they supplanted the clergy in the affections of the people. ‘*Esne professus? Etiam. A quo? A sacerdote meo. Et quis ille idiota? Nunquam theologiam audivit; nunquam in decretis vigilavit; nunquam unam quæstionem didicit enodare. Cæci sunt et duces cæcorum. Ad nos accedite, qui novimus lepram a lepra distinguere . . . Multi igitur, præcipue nobiles et nobilium uxores, apertis propriis sacerdotibus, prædicatoribus confitebantur . . . unde non mediocriter viluit ordinariorum dignitas.*’ . . . Matthew Paris then goes on to show the immorality thus introduced; since the people did not feel for the Mendicants any of that awe which their own priests had been accustomed to inspire, and therefore repeated their sins with less scruple. The same author (ad. ann. 1235) repeats the complaints of the insolence of the Mendicants, and of the extensive footing which they had already usurped upon the domains of the old establishments. In another place, (ann. 1247,) he describes them as the pope’s beadles and tax-gatherers. ‘*Utpote fratres minores et predicatores (ut credimus invitos) jam suos fecit Dominus Papa, non sine ordinis eorum læsione et scandalo, telonarios et bedellos.*’ . . . These passages were written within half a century from the foundation of the order. The evidence of the great Franciscan, Buonaventura, and of Thierri d’Apolde, both writers of the same age, is also adduced by Fleury, to prove the early corruption of the Mendicants. Bzovius (ann. 1304, sec. vii.) publishes a long decree of Benedict XI., still further augmenting the privileges of the Mendicants, and exempting them from certain episcopal restraints.

* *Pietr. delle Vigne. (i. Epist. 37). Fleury, lib. lxxxii., sec. 7. The Capucines, a branch of reformed Franciscans, did not arise till the beginning of the sixteenth century. Their progress, which was contemporary with that of the Lutherans and the Jesuits, is also described as extremely rapid.*

SECTION VI.

The Establishment of Nuns.

THAT there existed, even in the Antenicene Church, virgins, who made profession of religious chastity, and dedicated themselves to the service of Christ, is clear from the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Eusebius *. But there is no sufficient reason to believe that they were formed into societies; still less that they constituted any order or congregation. They exercised individually their self-imposed duties and devotions; and found their practice to be consistent, like the Ascetæ, among whom they may properly be classed, with the ordinary occupations of society.

The origin of Communities of female recluses was probably coeval with that of monasteries, and the produce of the same soil. The glory of the institution is commonly ascribed to St. Syncletica, the descendant of a Macedonian family settled in Alexandria, and the contemporary of St. Anthony. It is at least certain, that many such establishments were founded in Egypt before the middle of the fourth century; and that they were propagated throughout Syria, Pontus, and Greece, by the same means and at the same time with those of the Holy Brothers, though not, as it would seem, in the same abundance. It appears, however, that they gradually penetrated into every province where the name of Christ was known; they were found among the Armenians, Mingrelians, Georgians, Maronites, and others; and finally formed an important and not incongruous appendage to the Oriental Church.

A noble Roman lady, named Marcella, is celebrated as the instrument chosen by Providence to introduce the pious institution into the West. In emulation of the models of Egypt, she assembled several virgins and widows in a community consecrated to holy purposes; and her example found so many imitators, that the Fathers of the next generation, St. Ambrose †, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, bear sufficient testimony to the prevalence of the institution in their time. It is true that, at least as late as the year 400, many devout virgins (*Virgines Devotæ*) still preserved their domestic relations and adhered to the more secular practice of the Antenicene Church; and it is possible that those devotees were never wholly extinct in any age. But the Associations for the same end gradually embraced most of those with whom religious zeal was the leading motive; and their sanctity was recommended to popular reverence, as

* Vit. Constant. lib. iv., Tertullian, lib. ad Uxorem. Cyprian (lib. i. epist. xi. ad Pomponianum, De Virginitate) reproaches in very severe language certain consecrated virgins, who had fallen under the suspicion of incontinence,—‘Quid Christus Dominus et Iudex noster, cum virginem suam sibi dicatam et sanctitati suæ destinatam jacere cum altero cernit, quàm indignatur et irascitur!’ . . . Again: ‘Quod si in fide se Christo dedicaverunt, pudicè et castè sine ulla fabula perseverent. . . Si autem perseverare nolunt vel non possunt, melius est nubant, quam in ignem delictis suis cadant.’ . . . Again: (lib. v. epist. viii.) he speaks of ‘Membra Christo dicata et in æternum continentis honorem pudica virtute devota.’ . . . See also his ‘Tractatus de Disciplina et Habitu Virginum.’ . . . These passages show, at the same time, that there were in that age virgins dedicated to religion, and that they were not bound by any irrevocable vow.

† Lib. i. de Virginitate ad Marcellinam. The testimony of St. Jerome, respecting Marcella, has been already cited (supra, p. 396.). St. Augustine (De Moribus Ecclesiæ, c. 33.) says, in speaking of the monastic establishments both at Milan and Rome:—‘Jæunia prorsus incredibilia, non in viris tantum, sed etiam in feminis; quibus item, multis viduis et virginibus simul habitantibus et lana ac tela victum querentibus, præsumunt singulæ gravissimæ probatissimæque non tantum in instituendis componendisque moribus, sed etiam instruendis mentibus paritè et paratæ.’ See Marshall’s *Προβλήματα* to Dugdale, and Hospinianus de Orig. Monach., lib. iii. c. xi., et seq.

it may also have been exalted and fortified, by the discipline and the vow which restrained them.

The Rules, to which the convents of Nuns * were subject, were formed for the most part upon those which bound the monks. Like the monks, they lived from common funds, and used a common dormitory, table, and wardrobe; the same religious services exercised their piety; habitual temperance and occasional fasting were enjoined with the same severity. Manual labour was no less rigidly enforced; but instead of the agricultural toils imposed upon their 'Brethren,' to them were committed the easier tasks of the needle or the distaff. By duties so numerous, by occupations admitting so great variety, they beguiled the tediousness of the day †, and the dullness of monastic seclusion.

It appears probable, as is warmly argued by Hospinian ‡, that in the very early ages the virgins, who were dedicated to religious purposes, could enter without any scandal into the state of marriage. But we should recollect that, at that time, the monastic condition, properly speaking, did not exist. Immediately after its institution, we find the authority of St. Basil loudly declared against such a departure from the more perfect purity; that patriarch of monasticism does not hesitate to pronounce the marriage of a nun to be incest, prostitution, and adultery (*incestus, stupri scelus, et adulterium*); and Ambrose and Augustine exacted the same sacred obedience to the irrevocable vow. By the

* The words *Nonnus, Nonna*, are said to be of Egyptian origin. The latter is used by St. Jerome, *Epist. ad Eustochium Virginem*. Benedict of Nursia (*Regul. 63*) gives it the interpretation of paternal reverence, and ordains, that 'Juniores monachi priores suos *nonnos* vocent; quod intelligitur paterna reverentia.' The terms *Monialis* and *Sanctimonialis* are usually derived from *Mones*. Hospin. *Orig. Monach.*, lib. i. c. 1.

† The two following passages from St. Jerome deserve to be cited, since they show as well what were the vanities, as what were the duties, of the earliest nuns:—*Vestis tua nec sit satis munda, nec sordida, nullaque diversitate notabilis; ne ad te obviam prætereuntium turba consistat et digito monstreris. . . Plures . . hoc ipso capiunt placere quod placere contemnunt, et mirum in modum laus, dum vitatur, appetitur. . . Ne cogitatio tacita subrepat, ut, quia in auratis vestibus placere desiisti, placere coneris in sordidis; et quando in conventum fratrum veneris vel sororum, humilis (al. humi) sedearis; scabello te causeris indignam; vocem ex industria, quasi confectam jejuniis, non tennes, et deficientis mutata gressum humeris innitaris alterius. Sunt quippe nonnullæ exterminantes (extenuantes?) facies, ut appareant hominibus jejunantes; quæ statim ut aliquem viderint ingemiscunt, demittunt supercilium, et operata facie vix unum oculum liberant (al. librant) ad videndum. Vestis pulla, cingulum sacceum et sordidis manibus pedibusque; venter solus, quia videri non potest, æstuat cibo. Aliæ virili habitu, veste mutata, erubescunt esse quod natæ sunt; crinem ampuant et impudenter erigunt facies eunuchinas. Sunt quæ ciliciis vestiuntur et cucullis fabrefactis; ut ad infantiam redeant, imitantur noctuas et bubones. . . Hæc omnia argumenta sunt Diaboli.*—Hieron. (*Epist. xviii.*) ad Eustoch. Virginem.—Again, (*Epist. to Demetrias, De Servanda Virginit.*) 'Præter Psalmorum et Orationis ordinem, qui tibi hora tertia, sexta, nona, ad vesperem, media nocte, et mane semper est exercendus, statue quot horis Sanctam Scripturam ediscere debeas, quanto tempore legere, non ad laborem, sed ad delectationem ac instructionem animæ. Cumque hæc finieris spatia . . habeto lanam semper in manibus, vel staminis pollice fila deducito, vel ad torquenda subtegmina in alveolis fusa vertantur; aliarumque nota aut in globum collige, aut tenenda (nenda?) compone. Quæ texta sunt inspicere: quæ errata reprehendere: quæ facienda constitue. Si tantis operum varietatibus occupata fueris nunquam dies tibi longi erunt.' Similar instructions are delivered in *Epist. 86*, ad Eustochium Epitaph. Paulæ Matris. And St. Augustine (*De Morib. Ecclesiæ*, cap. 31.) mentions that the garments manufactured by the nuns were given to the monks in exchange for food. 'Lanificio corpus exercent et sustentant; vestesque ipsas fratribus tradunt, ab iis invicem quod victui opus est resumentes.' The *Tonsure* was not originally imposed, though it appears to have been an Egyptian custom.

‡ Lib. iii. c. xii.

Council of Chalcedon, nuns who married were made liable, together with their husbands, to the sentence of excommunication; yet in such manner, that penance might be imposed, if they reverently requested it, and communion restored in consequence of that penance, after a long interval proportioned to the offence. This canon was generally received in the West. But in the year 407, Innocent I. closed the outlet of penance, and left no loop-hole of forgiveness open to those who had violated their vow. Subsequent ages increased, rather than mitigated, this rigour; and imprisonment, and tortures, and death, were finally held out as the punishments of monastic incontinence. The resource of penance was still reserved by Innocent* for inconstant Novices—those who married, after having avowed the intention of chastity, but without having yet taken the veil.

The ceremony of consecration and the imposition of the veil was of origin earlier even than the time of St. Ambrose†; and it appears, that it might then be performed by a priest, no less *The Veil* than by a bishop. The words‡ pronounced on this occasion were prescribed by the Fourth Council of Carthage; but they varied, or were entirely changed, in subsequent times. The age at which the novice might be consecrated was equally variable, and seems to have been left, at least in early times, to the discretion of the prelate. An age as advanced as sixty years, appears at first to have been usual; but St. Ambrose gives reasons for permitting the veil to be sooner assumed; and the age of twenty-five was afterwards (generally, though by no means universally) established as the earliest, at which the recluse was permitted to place the indelible seal upon her resolution.

The first period, or, if we may so call it, the *Antiquity of Monachism*, was terminated in the Western Church by the epoch of St. Benedict; and it is generally recorded, *Benedictine Nuns*. that while that hermit was inventing his new institution for the brothers of his obedience, his sister Scholastica was raising the standard§, round which the holy virgins might collect with greater regularity and discipline. It would appear, however, that the rule of her disciples was rather given in restoration of the original observance, than on any new principle of religious seclusion. The alternations of industry and prayer; abstinence, silence, obedience, chastity, were ordained, as in the primitive establishments; and the first Benedictine Nuns were in fact rather reformed nuns of St. Basil, than a distinct order. . . . Howbeit, they acquired reputation and flourished so rapidly, that in the pontificate of Gregory the Great, Rome contained (according to the assertion|| of that Pope) three thousand ‘handmaids of God,’ (Ancillæ Dei,) who followed the Benedictine rule. And so boldly did they afterwards rise in rank and power, that about the year 813 it became

* Hospin. Orig. Monach. lib. iii. c. ult.

† We must not however be misled by the title of Tertullian's work, (*De Virginitate Velandis*), to ascribe to that practice so high an antiquity. The object of that book is only to show, that all virgins, as well as matrons, ought, in their attendance on divine worship, to be veiled. It has no reference to any particular condition of life.

‡ They were these—‘Aspice, filia, et intueri; et obliviscere populum tuum et domum patris tui, ut concupiscat Rex decorum tuum.’

§ Mabillon (Pref. Hist. Benedict.) asserts this Scholastica to have been the founder of regular nunneries in the West; and calls her ‘*Virginum Benedictinarum Duce*, Magistram et Antesignanam.’

|| Lib. vi. Epist. xxiii. See Hospinian, Orig. Monach. lib. iv. c. xvi. The ceremony of consecration, by the bishop, is here given at great length.

necessary to repress the pretended right of the Abbesses to consecrate and ordain, and perform other sacerdotal functions*.

The establishments of female recluses followed very closely the numerous diversities of the monastic scheme, and imitated the *Canonesses*. names of the male institutions, where they could not adopt their practice, or even their profession. An order of Canonesses-Regular was founded, or at least presented with a rule, by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 813. And we read, in later times, of a community of noble young ladies, who were associated under a very easy discipline, and unrestrained by any vow of celibacy, under the title of Canonesses-Secular. But these last pretenders to religious seclusion were, on more than one occasion, discountenanced by the authorities of the Church.

An imitation of the Military Orders might, at first sight, seem still more repugnant to the feelings and duties of holy virgins. But, in respect at least to the oldest of those orders, it was in fact far otherwise. That community originated (as has already been mentioned) in an office of gratuitous humanity;—to entertain the stranger, and to tend the sick, were the earliest offices of the Knight of the Hospital. By him, indeed, those humbler tasks may afterwards have been forgotten in the character of the soldier of the Cross; but the 'Nuns of the Hospital'† adhered to the earliest and the noblest object of the institution. Their foundation was contemporary with that of the Chevaliers; and in after times, they extended their establishments, and perhaps their charities, into every part of Europe.

The calamities of the Crusades were followed and alleviated by another institution, in which charitable females immediately took a share, and of which the purpose was not less worthy of its religious profession. A multitude of Christian captives had been thrown by the vicissitudes of war into the power of the Saracens; and for their redemption, the order of the 'Nuns of the Holy Trinity' was established very early in the thirteenth century. It survived the occasion which gave it birth, and flourished widely, under the patronage of certain pious princesses‡, especially in Spain.

The foundation of several nunneries divided with his other ecclesiastical duties the busy zeal of St. Dominic. And *Nuns of St. Dominic*. though we cannot discover that the essential characteristics of his order, preaching and mendicity, were in practice communicated to the holy sisters who bore his name, yet the name was sufficient to procure for them wealth and popularity; and they probably were not surpassed in either of those respects by any other order§. St. Catharine of Sienna, a vehement devotee, professed

* At the Council of Beconfield in Kent, abbesses subscribed their signatures, no less than Abbots and other Ecclesiastics. This is recorded to have been the first instance of such assumption of equality.

† A long account of these 'Religieuses Hospitalières,' together with the formalities of reception into the order, may be found in the Hist. des Ordres Monastiques, Trois. Partie, chap. xiv. We may remark that their 'Habits de Cérémonie de Chœur,' indicate wealth, if not vanity. The 'Religieuse Chevalière de l'Ordre de St. Jaques de l'Épée' was a Spanish invention of a much later age. This order seems to have originated at Salamanca.

‡ Hist. Ordres Monast. partie II. chap. xlix.

§ The historian 'Des Ordres Monastiques,' asserts, that when he wrote (about 1715), there were in Italy more than one hundred and thirty nunneries of that order, about forty-five in France, fifteen in Portugal, and forty in Germany, in spite of the devasta-

especially to reverence the virtues and imitate the discipline of St. Dominic; and she may properly be accounted among his "most genuine disciples, since she interposed to smooth the political difficulties of her country, and to influence, by her reason and authority, the most momentous concerns of the Church. Among the female Mendicants, the latest institution was that of the Carmelites. They appear to have been founded about 1452, by virtue of a bull of Nicholas V.; and nearly a century afterwards, they were reformed by the celebrated St. Theresa, a native of Castille.

We shall not trace the endless catalogue, nor enumerate the various names, under which the same or very similar institutions perpetually re-appeared. Among those of somewhat earlier times, that of St. Brigida, a Princess of Sweden, is most renowned. It was an establishment for the reception of both sexes—though separated in residence—under the superintendence of an Abbess; and its Rule* was confirmed by Urban V. about the year 1360. Though manual labour was strictly enjoined, the royal hand which founded the community appears, at the same time, to have blessed it with ample endowments. Of the more modern orders, there is also one which may seem to require our notice—that of the Ursulines. Its origin is ascribed † to Angela di *The Ursulines*, Brescia, about the year 1537, though the Saint from whom it received its name, Ursula Benincasa, a native of Naples, was born ten years afterwards. Its character was peculiar, and recalls our attention to the primitive form of ascetic devotion. The duties of those holy sisters were the purest within the circle of human benevolence—to minister to the sick, to relieve the poor, to console the miserable, to pray with the penitent. These charitable offices they undertook to execute without the bond of any community, without the obligation of any monastic vow, without any separation from society, any renouncement of their domestic duties and virtues. And so admirably were those offices, in millions of instances, performed, that, had all other female orders been really as useless and as vicious, as they are sometimes falsely described to be, the virtues of the Ursulines had alone been sufficient to redeem the monastic name.

But it is very far from true, that these other orders were either commonly dissolute or generally useless. Occasional scandals have engendered universal calumnies. To recite the mere names ‡ of those most

tions of the heretics. The order which bears the name of St. Catherine, was probably not founded by herself (though Hospinian asserts otherwise), and it is variously assigned to the year 1372 or 1455—a diversity which some attempt to reconcile. We shall have occasion to make further mention of this celebrated devotee in a following chapter.

* This Rule occupies eight folio pages in Hospinian, lib. vi. cap. 39. It professed to proceed from the immediate dictation of Christ.

† Hist. des Ordres Monast. Suite de la Trois. Partie, chap. xiv. et xx. The historian enumerates and describes thirteen congregations of Ursulines, established for the most part in France and in Italy.

‡ Such were the Religieuses Hospitalières de la Charité de Notre Dame, De Notre Dame du Refuge, De N. D. de la Misericorde, &c. Orphan asylums were numerous as 'the Congregations of St. Joseph.' Many were founded for the maintenance and education of poor girls; many for the sick; many for the penitent. In a description of the plague, in 1347, Fleury (Hist. Eccles. liv. xcv. s. 45) bears the following accidental testimony to female charity:—'Plusieurs Prêtres timides abandonnoient leurs troupeaux et en laissoient les soins à des Religieux plus hardis. Les Religieuses servoient les malades sans crainte, avec leur charité et leur humanité ordinaire. Plusieurs entre elles moururent, mais on les renouvelloit souvent.'

lately founded is sufficient to show that their professed objects were almost always excellent; and it would be as injurious to human nature, as it is contrary to historical evidence, to suppose that those objects were instantly abandoned, and made merely a cover for the opposite vices. In the more secular institutions of the other sex there was greater space for the operation of evil passions. In those polluted cloisters, the seeds of avarice were commonly nourished by the practice of profitable deceptions, and the prospect of opulent benefices. The holiest contemplations were interrupted by the voice of ambition inviting the most austere recluse to dignity and power—to abbacies, to prelacies; to the councils of kings, to that predominant apostolical eminence, whence kings and their councils were insulted and overthrown. . . . But into the cell of the female Devotee, those passions at least can seldom have intruded, because they had no object there *. Without insisting upon any natural predisposition to piety and benevolence, we may be well assured that the precincts of the convent were very fruitful in the exercise of both; and whatsoever judgment we may finally form respecting the character of that influence, which monachism has exercised through so many ages on so many forms of society, we may pronounce without hesitation the general purity and usefulness of the Female Orders.

Voltaire, in his Chapter on the Religious Orders, after eulogizing the charities of the female institutions in the noblest spirit of philanthropy, has remarked that 'those who have separated themselves from the Church of Rome have but faintly imitated that generous virtue.' The taunt is undeserved. We did not lay aside our charities, when we dispensed with our vows; we did not languish in the practice, when we rejected the profession; the religious motive acts not less powerfully, because the *name* is less commonly put forward; and in as far at least as the tender sex is concerned, there is not a district in our Cities, nor a village in our Provinces, which does not profit by the unpretending, unavowed, enlightened benevolence of Protestant Ursulines.

We shall now conclude a chapter—already disproportionate to the dimensions of this work, but far too contracted for the immensity of the subject—by a few obvious and almost necessary observations.

Without recurring to the less definite shape which monachism assumed in the West during the fourth and fifth ages, we may observe, that the three distinctive characters which it afterwards adopted were well suited to the several periods in which they successively rose and flourished. First in origin were the Regular Benedictine† Cœnobites; and they

* Some remarks have been suggested to us on this passage, which we recommend to the reader's consideration—premising, however, that the position in the text only affirms the moral superiority of nuns to monks, on the ground that *some* of the passions on which the habits of the latter were formed, had no object to rouse them in the former.

I cannot help thinking (says an ingenious friend) that the argument implied in the words 'passions which had no object there,' is fallacious. Many passions, if not all, will find objects, natural or unnatural. The danger of wandering, in the absence of express revelation, from that knowledge of the will of God, which may be collected from induction, is as pernicious to morals, as the *a priori* reasoning is to science. An institution preventing women from becoming wives and mothers, was immoral (considering the natural evidence of their propensities) in the same sense in which the opposition to the philosophy of Galileo was unreasonable.

† We do not here intend to distinguish between monks and canons, because both were Cœnobites, and possessed the same general characteristics, widely removed from the principles both of the Military and the Mendicant Orders—still less between the Original and Reformed Benedictines.

reigned without any rivals over the consciences of the faithful for above six centuries.—Those were centuries of the deepest ignorance and superstition which the history of Europe exhibits. That Order imitated the Oriental enthusiasm in which the whole system originated; it likewise inculcated moral severity, and exercised, in a greater or less degree, both useful industry and virtuous benevolence. As it thus grew in reputation and temporal grandeur, it extended and multiplied its demands upon human credulity. The most extravagant spiritual claims were recommended by a great parade, and by some reality, of devotion. Spacious and imposing edifices, whence the chaunt of holy voices was heard unceasingly to proceed in solemn prayer, by night and by day—some practice of charitable offices—great superiority in manner and education—the possession, almost exclusive, of the learning of the age—these advantages prepared an uninstructed people to receive with blindness any form of superstition, which their ghostly directors might think proper to impose on them, and gave efficacy to deception and imposture. And thus it proved, that, when superstition had once taken root in the soil of ignorance, it was nourished through so many ages by a much less proportion of moral and religious excellence, and scarcely more of knowledge, than had been necessary to plant it there. The most inactive among the forms of monachism was found sufficient to hold the human mind, as long as it was uninformed and unexcited, in servile subjugation.

The next which rose were the Military Orders,—and of these it is sufficient to remark, that they formed no regular part of the church system, but were the casual consequence of the Crusades. They were instituted, to assail the external enemies of the faith; they were continued, to repel their invasions, and defend the outworks of Christendom; but they did not very long survive the circumstances which created and sustained them. Indeed, the profession of arms in the name of Christ was so palpable a mockery of the true spirit of his religion, that its permanence was scarcely consistent with the fundamental principles of Christian society. An extraordinary occurrence could alone have given it existence, but it could not possibly give it perpetuity.

As corruption increased within the Church, and ignorance diminished without it, heresy began to spread widely, and the voice of reason found many listeners. And then it was that a band of active and intelligent emissaries was required for the maintenance of the established ecclesiastical system. For this purpose the talents of the Dominicans were more especially serviceable. But since a large measure of superstition still infected the lower orders, and none were wholly free from it, the abstinent and ragged devotion of the Franciscans was also not without its use, in exciting veneration towards themselves, and towards the Church, whose missionaries they were. Besides, the original Mendicants denounced, with courage and vehemence, the vices and the violences of the great. Their close connexion with the papal, or Guelphic interests, placed them in opposition to the imperial domination, and thus made them, in their political mediations, the advocates of liberal and popular principles. But above all, they were careful to provide themselves with that powerful weapon, which, from the days of St. Augustine to those of the Crusades, had entirely rested, and which had been very partially employed afterwards. True eloquence, indeed, is not commonly attainable; but they possessed and perpetually exercised that fluency of passionate declamation, which produced on the people all the effects of eloquence. It had

even some advantages over the more chastised effusions of antiquity*. It derived its authority from the oracles of God; the moral obligations which it urged were more directly subservient to human happiness; and its particular application in the mouth of the Mendicants was very commonly to a benevolent object,—to negotiate treaties, to reconcile party animosities, to stay the calamities of public or private warfare. Accordingly, the records of the thirteenth and following centuries abound with proofs of its efficacy and its influence in political, no less than in ecclesiastical, transactions. It has moreover been mentioned, that the Mendicants availed themselves with great address of the peculiar learning† of that age, and acquired uncommon dexterity in the perversion of reason. Conversant, more than any others, with the metaphysical subtleties of the schools, they well knew how, at the same time, to indulge the sophistical and the superstitious spirit of the age, and, by indulging, to nourish both. Thus they combined, for the defence of papacy, the abuse of reason with the abuse of religion; and their genius and their industry, by pandering to the existing prejudices, prolonged the servitude and degradation of the human mind.

¶ A Roman Catholic writer has observed, with a demonstration of pious gratitude, that the same God who raised up St. Athanasius against the Arians, and St. Augustine against the Pelagians, and St. Dominic and St. Francis against the Albigenses, deigned, in a later and still more perilous age, to call forth the spirit of Loyola against the Lutheran and Calvinistic apostates. And it may be, that at the moment when Luther was writing his book against monastic vows, the Spaniard was composing his 'Spiritual Exercises' for the restoration of other orders and the establishment of his own. It is only necessary for us to observe, that the defensive system of the Roman Church was completed by the institution of the Jesuits, though somewhat too late for its perfect preservation. And we may add, in pursuance of our other observations, that that order was as justly accommodated to the increasing intelligence of the sixteenth century, as were the Benedictines to the darkness of absolute ignorance, and the Mendicants to the twilight of reason. But each, in their turn of pernicious operation, though they enjoyed their appointed range and season of influence, were too feeble to prevent the revival, to arrest the growth, or to crush the maturity of truth and religious knowledge.

If we regard the monastic system in another point of view, we shall perceive it to consist in a continual succession of reformations. The foundation of every institution was laid, as it rose out of the corruption of its predecessor, in poverty, in the most rigid morality, in the duties of religion, of education, of charity. The practice first, and next the show, of these qualities, led, in

* A comparison in favour of the Mendicants is ingeniously drawn by Denina, lib. xii. cap. vi.

† Giannone even asserts, that the merit to which the Mendicants were chiefly indebted for the favour of the Popes, was their success in substituting the scholastic, for the dogmatic theology and the study of antiquity and history, so as to occupy the minds of the learned with abstract and useless questions and disputes, and so many *contrast* and *raggiri*, that, no one not conversant with that art could confront them with any hope of success. It was indeed by such a method of reasoning that the pretensions of Rome were best defended; and the Mendicants were bound to defend them, since all their exemptions, and much of their property, flowed *directly* from Rome; for the Pope not uncommonly gave them convents belonging to other Orders.

every instance, to wealth ; and wealth was surely followed, first, by the relaxation of discipline—next, by the contempt of decency. Then followed the necessity of reform ; and the same system was regenerated under another, or perhaps under the same name, and passed through the same deteriorating process to a second corruption. Again,—the Reformed Order was re-reformed and re-regenerated, and again it fell into decay and dissolution. The history of the monastic orders, when pursued into the details of the several establishments, presents to us an unvarying picture of vigour, prosperity, dissension, followed by new statutes, and a stricter rule. A system, of which the foundations were not placed either in Scripture or in reason, was necessarily liable to perpetual change ; nor was it capable of any other condition of existence, than one of continual decay and reproduction.

If we reflect for an instant on the outlines of Western Monachism, we observe, that the Rule of Benedict of Nursia had already fallen into great degradation, when it was revived by Benedict of Aniane. The system then flourished with extraordinary vigour ; but for so short a period, that when, about the year 900, the Reformed Order of Cluni was established, its founders deserved the glory of restoring the ancient discipline ; and that event is justly considered as marking an important epoch in monastic history. Again, within two other centuries, we observe the younger and more rigid Cisterrians censuring the secular pride and luxurious relaxation of their rivals. In the next age, it was proposed to heal the disorders, or at least to supply the deficiencies, of the old system, by the super-addition of the Mendicants, models of primitive and apostolical austerity*. But even the very slight notice, which we have been able to bestow on the history of the Franciscans, has proved how very early they fell into disorders, succeeded, though not repaired, by reformation. Even the institution of St. Dominic was very far from securing the purity of his children ; indeed, it was at no distant period from their foundation, that a part of them assumed the distinctive appellation of Reformed Dominicans. (*Dominicani Riformati.*) . . . By this process of continual change and restoration, the monastic system maintained an influence, varying extremely in degree, but never wholly suspended, over the nations of the West for eleven hundred years. That it did so, may well surprise us, if we consider only the principles of its first foundation, and the monstrous and avowed abuses, which at various periods infected it. But on the other hand, it was sustained by an infusion of much real piety and of many unquestioned virtues ; and it was prolonged from time to time by a series of judicious and seasonable alterations, such as are able to give permanence even to a feeble and mischievous establishment, and without which there is no security even for the wisest and the most excellent.

Still this last cause had alone been insufficient. It is not possible, that any policy of Church government could have upheld the system so long and so triumphantly, if it had not possessed something not only plausible in its principle, and respectable in its profession, but also practical and profitable in its influence on society. It would be ungrateful

* This was, indeed, to seek safety in the opposite extreme, and by the *entire* renunciation of all temporalities to exceed the severity of St. Benedict ; but the disease at that time demanded a violent remedy. The choice for such an Order lay between bodily labour and mendicity—the latter was preferred, as being, in name, more humiliating, and also more consistent with intellectual attainments, and the grand spiritual offices of instructing the vulgar, converting heretics, &c.

and unjust to disparage the benefits which it has really conferred on former ages, and of which the consequences may have reached our own.

We may comprehend all the useful merits, which have ever been claimed for monachism, with any shadow of reason, under four heads. (1.) The earliest monks lived by the labour of their hands; and the large tracts of waste land, with which their houses were endowed, were brought into cultivation by their personal exertions. Even in the eighth and ninth centuries, when they became for the most part clerks, their estates continued to bear marks of more careful superintendence; their serfs and dependents were more numerous and more prosperous; cities grew up under their economy; provinces were fertilized, forests and marshes were peopled under their administration. Nor is there any reason to question, what is generally admitted, that the vassals of the monasteries were raised at least some degrees nearer to domestic comfort and civilization, than those of the adjacent baronies.

(2.) The earliest monasteries were very commonly consecrated to the discharge of important moral and social, as well as religious, duties. That of hospitality, or the entertainment of travellers and pilgrims, was certainly practised with great fidelity; and in ages and countries in which inns and caravanseras* were yet unknown, and even the personal safety of the stranger was ill secured by law, it was usefully and benevolently instituted, that his reception and protection should, in some manner, be associated with the offices of religion. The worldly authority of religion is never more profitably employed, than in supplying the defects of police, of government, and civilization. And thus it proved, that, during the five or six centuries of confusion and barbarism, which followed the subversion of the Western Empire, the monastic system became a powerful instrument in correcting the vices of society, and alleviating their pressure on the lower orders.

The earliest donations, with which the Church was enriched, were for the most part the genuine unconditional fruits of superstition. But in somewhat later times, when it was discovered that the property of the Church was liable not only to spoliation by laymen, but to abuse by churchmen, the profusion of the pious admitted the admixture of human motives, and was less than formerly directed to the support of the clergy, more to that of the poor and miserable. Accordingly, among the ecclesiastical records of the eighth and ninth centuries, no less than of those which followed, we find many monuments†, which prove the general application of a part (and in some few cases the greater part) of the revenues of certain monasteries to the use of the sick, the poor and the

* Muratori shows that the use of inns, as places of reception for strangers, was as late as the eleventh or twelfth century. He throws great light on the nature of the earliest Christian establishments for that purpose, in Dissertations 37 and 56.

† Among those produced by Muratori, are some bearing the dates 759, 812, 790, 718, 721, 757, 764, 847, 825, &c. A charter given to the monks of Modena, in 996, contains these words:—*Et domum Hospitalem habeant, ubi secundum morem hospites de decimis laborum suorum recipiant.* Some assert, that, before the middle of the eighth century, there was no monastery in the west which had not an Hospital attached to it; and we have remarked that in later ages, that was, in at least one instance, the very foundation on which a new order was established. We might add that such was the origin of the Ordre du Saint Esprit at Montpellier; and we observe that in 1198, Innocent III. rebuilt an Hospital, which had been founded at Rome, in 715, by a Saxon king for the use of Saxon pilgrims.

traveller. A particular building* appropriated to these purposes was attached to many monasteries, and was an essential part of the establishment. Thus, these religious institutions became the channel, through which the benevolence of the wealthy was communicated to the lower classes. And though the charity, which seemed to acquire sanctity by passing through that medium, may sometimes have been diminished or perverted, there can be no doubt that much of it reached its destination, even in the worst ages of the church. In seasons of general strife and anarchy, the contributions of the pious found their best hope of security and usefulness in monastic hands; and if the sacred deposit was sometimes violated by the treacherous avarice of those to whom it was confided, a much greater portion was unquestionably applied to its intended purpose, the alleviation of disease and misery.

In the Eastern Church, the introduction of every variety† of charitable establishment immediately followed the reception of the Gospel. It was the work of Christian principles and of Christian men; and was closely, though not inseparably, connected with the monastic institution. Two of the greatest patrons of that system, St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, were likewise the founders of hospitals (Nosocomia): places of entertainment for strangers (Xenodochia) were early attached to several Churches, and deacons appointed to discharge their duties. But the monasteries of the East were at no period so enriched by charitable deposits, as those of the Latin Church: for the monks in those countries never obtained influence so despotic over a more enlightened people; and a more settled form of civil government secured the wealthy against the rapine, to which they were continually liable under the feudal anarchy.

But it was not merely in respect to their temporal necessities that the people, and especially the lower orders, were benefited by those establishments. Many blessings were at the same time conferred by their religious character; many afflictions were consoled, many hopes suggested, many sins prevented, by the exertions of pious monks. Those brothers, though exalted as a community, were not individually removed above the condition of the peasants, and they had commonly the same origin; so that the intercourse was close and searching, and its advantages frequently reciprocal. There are many spiritual wounds, which are most effectually probed and healed by a pastor, whose condition, whose associations and understanding, are not much elevated above those of the penitent. A more perfect confidence, a deeper sympathy, is then excited, than when the parties are widely separated in rank or intellect. This advantage the monks in general possessed over the secular clergy in the Roman Church; and to this we may partly attribute the superiority of their influence. That this influence was often abused, we know too well; nor can there be any doubt that the intercourse which led to it has been sometimes injurious. But during the better ages of monachism, it is unquestionable that the blessings of that religious connexion between the monks and the poor were greatly predominant.

* Some of these, called *Matricule*, seem to have corresponded very nearly with our poor-houses. The *Domus Hospitalis* was nearly synonymous: a Church was usually founded with them. We have an instance of one of these built by Ansaldo at Lucca, in 784, on the condition 'that every week, twelve poor and strangers should be admitted to the table of the Church.' There are abundant records of such establishments; but some of them were, in process of time, seized and appropriated by the lay-rector. See Muratori, *Dissert.* 37.

† This is proved by the mere use of the terms *Xenodochia*, *Gerontocomia*, *Nosocomia*, *Orphanotrophia*, *Brephotrophia*, *Ptochotrophia*, so familiar to the writers of these ages.

It is the boast of St. Bernard that those who had embraced the monastic condition lived with greater purity than other men; that they fell less frequently and rose more quickly; that they walked with greater prudence; were more constantly refreshed with the spiritual dew of heaven; rested with less danger; died with greater hope. And far as the monastic practice has generally fallen below its profession, we doubt not, that in the earlier ages, and especially in the infancy of their several institutions, their inmates surpassed all other classes of society, not excepting the secular clergy, in the exercise of moral and religious offices. Devoted to the relief of the poor, and the service of the sick and the stranger, they were so placed, that even the imperfect discharge of their charitable duties conferred no scanty benefits on an uncivilized generation. Among the millions who have entered religious houses, under the most solemn vows of virtue and piety, there must have been multitudes whose mere innocence made at least some amends to society for their seclusion from its care and its temptations; there were certainly many, whose acquirements and indisputable excellence threw out a light and example to their contemporaries; and some there were, and not a few, whose eminent qualities were directed, as steadily as the spirit of their age allowed them, to the honour and improvement of their Church—to alleviate private affliction, and mitigate the general barbarism.

(3.) From the earliest period, in the Eastern as well as in the Roman Church, the duties of education were entrusted to the monks. In process of time they became, in the latter Church, nearly confined to them, and they continued so at least as late as the eleventh century. Monastic schools were established by St. Benedict; they were inseparably attached to his institutions, and spread, with the progress of his order, over the kingdoms of the West; and they were open to children of the earliest age*. It would seem that, in the eighth century, the cathedral or episcopal academies† were first established; and these afterwards became the most distinguished for the rank and eminence of their scholars. They were conducted, under the superintendence of the bishop, by the canons of the cathedral. And here we need only repeat a former observation, that, if the office of instruction was confined to the clergy, so also were its benefits, for many ages, to those intended for the ministry. So that the advantages which those establishments really conferred on the body of society were neither immediate nor certain; while the power of the clergy, being unduly exaggerated by the exclusive possession of learning, was thereby placed upon a principle absolutely at variance with the highest earthly interests of man.

(4.) This subject naturally leads us to our last consideration—the extent and character of the literature, whether sacred or profane, which was protected and nourished in the monastic establishments. On the first matter, Roman Catholic writers do not hesitate to ascribe the very

* This was peculiar to the order of St. Benedict. Hist. Litt. de la France, Siècle xii. p. 11. See also Mabillon, Etudes Monastiques, p. 1. ch. xi. The same writer (ch. xv.) enumerates several among the early Christian heroes,—Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Jerome, &c.—who studied for a greater or less time in monasteries. St. Basil, in the first instance, established a school in his monastery for the reading of holy (as distinguished from profane) histories, and appointed rewards for superior merit. 'Nunquam de manu et oculis recepat liber,' says St. Jerome; and it is from the same monastic student that we have received that much condemned precept, 'ne ad scribendum cito prosilias. Multo tempore prius discere quod doceas.'

† See Mosh. vol. ii. p. 55.

preservation of the pure doctrine of the Church to the refuge which it found within those fortresses—though it may seem doubtful, whether that doctrine might not have been preserved with equal purity, through ages too ignorant for controversy or cavi, by the fidelity of the secular clergy. At any rate, this praise can scarcely be granted to the monks without some qualification. For if it be true that, during the Arian controversy, they were the most zealous defenders of the Nicene faith, it is not less certain, that the principles of Origen, and the mystical * interpretation of Scripture gained great footing among them, and that not merely in the East; nor should the support which they persevered in affording to the cause of the Images, during that long and angry controversy, be forgotten in any estimate which we may endeavour to form of their pretensions to doctrinal or ecclesiastical purity. It is indeed unquestionable, that the externals of religion, so valuable to the Latin church, its offices†, and ceremonies, were enriched and dignified by the monks and canons. They acquired an imposing splendour from the number engaged in their performance, and the resources of their several communities. But passing over these equivocal merits, we may mention one great and truly incalculable service which those establishments conferred on future ages, though they neglected to derive much advantage from it themselves. They preserved, through dangerous and turbulent periods, ancient copies of the inspired writings, and of the most valuable commentaries made on them in the earliest times. And those were among the most profitable moments of monastic leisure, which were employed in multiplying the sacred manuscripts ‡.

Though religious houses were intended to be the depositaries of virtue and piety §, not of letters, yet letters were, to a certain extent, encouraged there, as subsidiary to the grand object of the institution. It is shown, indeed, by the learned author || of the ‘*Monastic Studies*,’ that the earliest monks entirely renounced profane literature, and confined their diligence to theological works and contemplations: the authority and example of St. Jerome confirmed that preference. But in later times, and especially when

* This is said to have been, in the first instance, occasioned by the substitution of mental prayer for manual labour. From the excesses of mysticism proceeded the errors of the Beghards and Beguines, and other enthusiasts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; they strove after absolute perfection, and they fell into fanaticism.

† Fleury, *Discours. depuis 800. . 1100.* Muratori, *Dissertat.* 56. The monks gained great advantages by the introduction of chaunts into the service; and this was imitated, in the ninth century, by the cathedral clergy. Some rivalry ensued between these ecclesiastics, and thus, ‘*cœpit frequentius agi et augustius procedere divina Res.*’ Some ‘modulation of prayers and praises,’ they had indeed used from the earliest ages; but not with that plenitude and majesty, which the chorus of monks and canons afterwards introduced. The organ appears to have come into use about the year 826.

‡ The great increase of MSS. during the eleventh century, is to be ascribed to this monastic leisure, and could scarcely be effected otherwise. And this was the first step, after the devastation of the four preceding ages, towards the revival of ancient, and the creation of modern, learning. In the twelfth age we find St. Bernard inculcating the duties of writing and copying as the best substitute for labour.

§ The words of St. Peter, ‘We have left all to follow Thee,’ are those, as St. Bernard observed, which have founded cloisters and peopled deserts.

|| Mabillon (*Études Monastiques*, p. 1.) proves the prevalence of literary industry, in the monastic life, by direct historical evidence; by the multitude of learned ecclesiastics who emerged from them; by their libraries; by direct reference to the rule of St. Benedict. To the neglect of study he attributes the decline of the several Orders, and observes, that reform was commonly attended by its restoration; that academies or colleges were invariably connected with the Benedictine establishments; and that both Popes and Councils perpetually inculcated the duty of study.

the practice of manual labour fell into disuse, the limits of their studious industry were enlarged, and they gradually embraced some department of profane science, as well as of classical lore. The compilation of Decretals led to the study of canon law; the discovery of the Digest directed attention to civil legislation. The art of medicine presented a spacious field, which was made attractive, first, perhaps, by its salutary and charitable uses, afterwards by the gain* which followed it. The monastic establishments furnished the leisure and the best existing instruments for all those pursuits; and, after the eighth or ninth age, they were distinguished by some efforts after knowledge, not fruitless of beneficial effects and even of useful discoveries.

Again, many of the most precious monuments of profane antiquity owe their preservation to the sanctity of the monasteries, or to the zeal of their defenders. All these might have perished, as many, notwithstanding, did perish, had there not existed, during the long and barbarous anarchy of the Western Empire, certain communities, associated in the name of religion for peaceful, if not pious, purposes; whose interests were opposed to the progress of disorder and rapine, and whose holy profession secured them some respect from a lawless, but superstitious, people. The diligence which was employed in transcribing those valuable models, while it promoted their circulation, could scarcely fail to infuse some taste or energy into the dullest mind; and it certainly appears, that during the eighth and ninth, and especially the eleventh ages, most† of the characters, who acquired any ecclesiastical celebrity, proceeded from the discipline of the cloister.

Having thus intended to give a general view of the advantages which the monastic system has conferred on society, we cannot fail to observe, that they are for the most part confined to ages of ignorance or turbulence; that they were almost proportionate to the debasement of the people, and to the weakness or wickedness of the civil government. The former of those evils was somewhat alleviated, the latter was partially obviated, by the monastic institutions. Herein is comprehended the sum and substance of their utility. In a civilized nation, under a just and enlightened rule, it is their necessary effect to obstruct industry and retard improvement. But, on the other hand, if we consider them in reference to the times in which they rose and began to flourish,—if we compare the habits, the morals, the intelligence of the monks with those of their secular contemporaries,—shall we not immediately admit, that in bad ages they were probably the best men; that they were the most useful members of a disjointed community; that their vicious principles were less vicious than the general principles of society; that they were in advance of the civilization of their day? If so—and to us it appears indisputable—let us be cautious how we cast unqualified censure upon a body of religious persons, who formed, for the space of five or six centuries, the most respectable portion of the Christian world.

* A council held at Rheims, under Innocent II. in 1131, published a canon, prohibiting monks and canons-regular to study civil law or medicine; and the injunction was repeated by the Lateran Council in 1139. These occupations were on this occasion expressly ascribed to avarice. And we may remark, that the prohibition was confined to the monks—the secular clergy, in the entire ignorance of the laity, were permitted to practise both law and physic.

† Bede, Alcuin, Willibrod, &c. were monks; and most of the Popes and Cardinals of the eleventh century rose from the ranks of the regular clergy. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, xi. Siècle.

At the same time, we ought not to forget, that, even in those times to which their utility was confined, it was continually obstructed both by the original defects of *Superstitious tendency*, their system, and its consequent corruptions.

Almost from their first establishment, in the East no less than in the West, we find them the faithful defenders, if not parents, of *superstitious abuse*. The adoration of saints, the miraculous qualities of relics, and the homage due to them, and, above all, the sanctity and worship of images, have been inculcated with peculiar zeal by the monks of every order, in every age of the church. Again, as they ever have been the patrons of religious abuse, so have they inflexibly opposed any *general attempt at church reform*. Reforms, indeed, in their particular establishments have been incessant. Such, again, as touched the discipline of the secular clergy have sometimes found support in the jealousy of the regular orders. But any exertion, tending to the restoration of pure Christianity, has ever found its fiercest opponents in the cloister; and through such opposition many unscriptural practices have been perpetuated both in the Eastern and Western Churches. Of course it is not intended to ascribe to them all the corruptions of religion; indeed, we have already traced the origin of many of these to a period preceding the creation of monachism. The 'vices of the clergy' are acknowledged in ecclesiastical records long before the prevalence of monastic influence; and it seems probable even that the traffic in indulgences finally so scandalous to the Mendicants, was begun by the bishops*. But all existing abuses were carefully nourished and fostered by the hands of monks; and the execution of miracles and other popular impostures was conducted with peculiar ingenuity and success by the inmates of the monastery†. And we may add, that the lucrative system of Purgatory was then most zealously supported, as indeed the wealth which flowed from it was distributed for the most part among those establishments.

In early ages the monks were the subjects, and, as it were, the army of the bishops; they maintained *their* rights, they fought their battles, and profited by their protection. In the East this mutual relation long subsisted; and as the original monasteries were expressly subjected, by the Council of Chalcedon, to the bishop of the diocese, and as many were indebted for their foundation to episcopal munificence and piety, the claims were just, and the connexion natural. But in the Roman Church it was violated almost by the first movements of papal ambition. In the year 591, Gregory the Great‡ (himself for some time the inmate of a monastery) held a Council, in which were passed many regulations favourable to what the monks considered their independence. They were permitted to choose their own abbot; and the *Exemptions* bishop was precluded not only from all interference in

* See Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 420. We may remark, that the same author sometimes distinguishes the regular canons as more exempt from the vices which he so indiscriminately objects to the other monastic orders.

† The Carthusians are stigmatized by monastic writers for inferiority in that power, if not for the entire destitution of it. The consequence is, that, having performed few or no miracles, they boast very few names in the calendar of the saints. See Hospinian, lib. v. cap. vii.

‡ Giannone, Stor. Nap., lib. iv., cap. xii. Mosheim, seemingly overlooking this circumstance, is disposed to attribute the growing alliance of the popes and monks in the eleventh century to the oppression and rapacity of princes and bishops. (Cent. xi. p. 2, chap. ii.) Doubtless there were instances of this; but the principle of the alliance was of much earlier origin.

their temporalities, and all exercise of jurisdiction over them, but even from the celebration of the divine offices in their churches. From this event (if from any single event) we may probably date the undue aggrandizement of the monastic order, and its increasing influence on civil as well as ecclesiastical politics. But in independence it only so far gained, as to exchange a near for a distant master—a petty tyrant, it might be, for an imperious but partial despot. One evil effect of this change was presently felt,—the removal of the bishop's immediate superintendence facilitated the progress of abuse and licentiousness*. The eighth and ninth ages were, in truth, the most triumphant era of monasticism†. Whatsoever learning then existed was confined, or nearly so, to the convents; and not only did nobles and kings contest with each other the honour of endowing them, but there were many who took refuge there in their own persons from the miseries and dangers of a turbulent world. By such secession they conferred the security which they courted; and additional sanctity seemed to surround the buildings which were dignified by the retreat of great, perhaps even of good, men.

Absolute exemptions from episcopal authority were for some time rare. The first instance was probably that of Monte Cassino, which might be excused by its vicinity to Rome. But the example, though sparingly imitated, was by no means lost on following times; and after the pontificate of Gregory VII., the abbots began universally to claim the immediate protection of St. Peter; and his Vicar was seldom slow to accord it. In process of time, entire congregations of monasteries (the Clunian, for instance, and the Cistercian) were included in a single exemption; so afterwards were the Mendicant Orders; and finally the whole monastic body acknowledged no other dependence than on the Pope‡ alone. The abuse was at length pushed so far, that even a private clerk might obtain—of course by purchase—exemption from the control of his bishop. Undoubtedly, during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the Holy See derived great power from the sort of separate hierarchy thus established; and for the two following ages, when ambition became less its ruling spirit, and avarice more so, such exemptions became the means of abundantly gratifying the favourite passion. But in the excess to which they were then carried, they shook the foundation of papal power, by inflaming the jealousy and disunion of the regular and secular clergy; and thus they mainly tended to promote, in due season, the rise of the Reformation, and to facilitate its progress.

<p>At the same time, if the Popes were long supported and aggrandized</p> <p><i>Monastic Wealth. Purgatory, Indulgences, &c.</i></p>	<p>through their close connexion with the monastic Orders, so were they very sedulous to return the favour, and to enrich those Orders, sometimes at the</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

* One of Charlemagne's Capitularies prohibited abbots and abbesses from keeping fools, buffoons, and jugglers, for their amusement. But this implied no particular censure on the monastic orders, since we observe the same prohibition to be extended to bishops.

† Giannone, lib. v. cap. vi. The same have also been considered as the grand periods of episcopal authority. Both may be true. For the monasteries, though in some cases, and to a certain extent, independent of the bishops, were not yet placed in rivalry with them; but they probably made common cause, whenever the general interests of the Church were concerned.

‡ The papal right to grant these exemptions does not seem to have been disputed. Yet it rested on no better foundation than a confused notion, confirmed and augmented by the Decretals, that there were no limits to that authority. We should observe, that even in the East there were also instances of the direct dependence of monasteries on the Patriarch; but they were rare, and probably in faint imitation of the practice of the West.

expense of the secular clergy, but more usually by contributions from the laity. In earlier ages, the profusion of kings and nobles abundantly satiated the avarice of every department of the church; but when this spirit gradually expired, and new Orders were still everywhere starting up, professing poverty, and clamorous for wealth, it became necessary to open new resources for their nourishment. These were easily discovered in the fruitfulness of superstition. Purgatory presently assumed a more definite shape; and it was no difficult office for the priests, who created it, to conduct its administration and economy. Their power over the concerns of that state was believed on the same authority, which had established its existence. This grand invention, with the devices of masses, indulgences, &c., which flowed from it, extended its influence from the highest even to the lowest classes of the people; so that through these means every condition of society became tributary to the church. The monks enjoyed a very great share in the profits of this imposture. During the tenth and eleventh centuries, the reputation to which they had already risen was so much augmented by the foundation and name of Cluni, that some are disposed to date their triumph over the secular clergy from this period *—it is certain that the attention of churchmen was from this time more anxiously directed to their temporalities † than heretofore. . . . After the institution of the Mendicants, the lucrative ‡ departments of the profession were chiefly committed to their superintendence; and it was especially through their heedless abuse of favours, as heedlessly lavished on them by a succession of necessitous Popes, and most so through the public and confessed venality of indulgences, that the deformities of the papal system became generally acknowledged and execrated. These were the scandals which, more than any of its pretensions and impostures, awakened the indignation of mankind. And thus it came to pass, in the fulness of time, that out of the bosom of that very order which had been most instrumental in supporting papal power, and corrupting the very corruptions of religion, the voice of Providence was pleased to call forth the great restorer of his holy church. While the Benedictines were reposing in their luxurious edifices—while the Mendicants were openly prostituting for gold the offices and pretended solaces of religion, the progress of knowledge and the increase of corruption prepared the field of triumph for the Saxon reformer.

* It is probable that they far surpassed the secular clergy of this time in austerity and even in real piety of life, which was not, indeed, any very difficult triumph. It is certain that they now began to apply not only to study, but to business, which the seculars almost equally neglected. Hence the succession of five monks, who, during the eleventh age, governed the Church for fifty years; and to whom Mosheim, in his unqualified hatred for everything monastic, attributes almost all its sins.

† Giannone (Stor. Nap., lib. vii., cap. v.) remarks, that censures and excommunications—those spiritual weapons which hitherto had been usually employed for the correction of sin—were from this period chiefly directed against persons who plundered or alienated the property of the Church.

‡ It is worthy of remark that the French, in pursuance of their constant determination to preserve themselves from pure papacy, strongly discouraged the acquisition of property in France by the Mendicants, fairly objecting to them their unequivocal vow of poverty.

CHAPTER XX.

History of the Popes, from the Death of Innocent III. to that of Boniface VIII.

The ardour of the Popes for Crusades—its motives and policy—Honorius III.—Frederic's vow to take the cross, and procrastination—Gregory IX.—his Coronation—he excommunicates the Emperor—who thus departs for Palestine—Gregory impedes his success, and invades his dominions—their subsequent disputes—Innocent IV.—his previous friendship with Frederic—Council of Lyons—various charges urged against Frederic—Innocent deposes Frederic and appoints his successor, on his own papal authority—Civil war in Germany—in Italy—death of Frederic—his character and conduct—his rigorous Decree against Heretics—Observations—Other reasons alleged to justify his deposition—this dispute compared with that between Gregory VII. and Henry—Taxes levied by the Pope on the Clergy—Crusade against the Emperor—Exaltation of Innocent—his visit to Italy and intrigues—his death—his qualities as a statesman—as a churchman—expression of the Sultan of Egypt—Alexander IV.—Urban IV.—Clement IV.—Introduction of Charles d'Anjou to the throne of Naples—Gregory X.—his piety, and other merits—Second Council of Lyons—Vain preparations for another Crusade—Death of Gregory—Objects of Nicholas II.—Martin IV.—Senator of Rome—Nicholas IV. diligent against Heresy—Pietro di Morano or Celestine V.—circumstances of his elevation—his previous life and habits—his singular incapacity—disaffection among the higher Clergy—his discontent and meditations—his resignation—Boniface VIII.—his excessive ambition and insolence—on the decline of the papal power—his temporal pretensions—Sardinia, Corsica, Scotland, Hungary—Recognition of Albert King of the Romans—and act of his submission—Philip the Fair—The Gallican Church—origin of its liberties—Differences between Boniface and Philip—Bull *Clericis Laicos*—its substance and subsequent interpretation—Affairs of the Bishop of Flanders—Bull *Ausculta Fili*—burnt by Philip—Conduct of the French Nobles—of the Clergy—of Boniface—Bull *Unam Sanctam*—other violent proceedings—Moderation of Philip—further insolence of the Pope—Philip's appeal to a General Council—William of Nogaret—Personal assault on Boniface—his behaviour and the circumstances of his death.

THE Church of Rome had now so habitually stained herself with blood, as to be callous to the common feelings of nature, and insensible to the miseries of mankind. For more than a century she had employed her power in promoting the destruction of human life, by the most senseless expeditions: and as the ruinousness and vanity of the Crusades became more manifest, she seemed to redouble her exertions to renew and perpetuate them; for she thrived by contributions levied for this purpose, and by the property which was thus thrown under ecclesiastical protection; and she gathered strength through the weakness of monarchs, and the superstition of their subjects. Again, after Innocent had succeeded in an additional outrage upon humanity and reason, by converting the machine, which had been intended against the enemies of Christ, into an engine of domestic persecution and torture, it became more than ever the interest of the pope to keep alive a spirit, which might so easily be made to deviate into arbitrary channels. And thus the zeal for Crusades, which inflamed the breast of Innocent, passed without any diminution into those of his successors. Moreover, it is well known how earnestly the holy See supported the interests of Frederic II. against Otho IV., as long as the former was the weaker party, and how zealously it began to raise enemies against him, as soon as he became powerful; while the industry, with which it renewed and prolonged the contests between the Guelphs and the Ghibelines—contests which lacerated the vitals of Italy—furnishes melancholy proof, that its interests were even at this time associated with every principle that is subversive of peace and baneful to society; and that it pursued those interests with callous, persevering, uncompromising obduracy.

Innocent III. was succeeded by Honorius III., a native of Rome, who

for four years had been governor of Palermo under Frederic II.; but the remembrance of that connexion was easily thrown off, as soon as he rose from the condition of a subject to *Honorius III.* that of a rival. Frederic had made a solemn vow to Innocent, to engage without loss of time in a new crusade; and on his coronation at Rome, in 1220, he renewed that promise with still greater solemnity to Honorius. In the year following, instead of proceeding on his expedition, he appears to have appointed, on his own authority, to some vacant see; in virtue, as he maintained, of his royal right; in violation, as the pope asserted, of the liberties of the church. During the time consumed in this dispute, Damietta fell into the power of the Mahometans. In the year 1223, at a council held at Terentino in Campania, the Emperor renewed his oath to depart, and that within the space of two years; and to give earnest of his sincerity, he espoused the daughter of John of Brienne, King of Jerusalem. In the year following, that he might atone to the church for his continued delay, and evince to her the sincerity of his affection, he published some savage constitutions against heretics, which we shall presently notice. At the same time, in a long letter to the Pope, he complained of the general indifference to the cause of the Crusades, which then unfortunately prevailed throughout Europe*. Some disputes with the Lombards formed the next excuse for his delay; and in 1227 Honorius died, still pressing the departure of the monarch, and still pressing it in vain.

Gregory IX., who was a nephew of Innocent III., was immediately raised to the pontifical chair, with loud and unanimous acclamation. On the day of his coronation he proceeded *Accession of Gregory IX* to St. Peter's, accompanied by several prelates, and assumed the pallium according to custom; and after having said mass he marched to the palace of the Lateran, covered with gold and jewels. On Easter Day, he celebrated mass solemnly at Sta. Maria Maggiore, and returned with a crown on his head. On Monday, having said mass at St. Peter's, he returned wearing two crowns, mounted on a horse richly caparisoned, and surrounded by Cardinals clothed in purple, and a numerous clergy†. The streets were spread with tapestry, inlaid with gold and silver, the noblest productions of Egypt, and the most brilliant colours of India, and perfumed with various aromatic odours. The people chaunted aloud *Kyrie eleison*, and their songs of joy were accompanied by the sound of trumpets. The judges and the officers shone in gilded habits and caps of silk. The Greeks and the Jews celebrated the praises of the Pope, each in his own language; a countless multitude marched before him carrying palms and flowers; and the sena-

* See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. l. 78, sect. 65, where a part of the letter is quoted. The actual restitution of the territories of the Countess Matilda to the Roman See, is by some ascribed to this Pontificate. Raynaldus (ann. 1221, Num. 29) asserts, that the imperial diploma existed in the Liber Censuum of the Vatican library—apud Pagi. Vit. Honor. iii. Sect. xxxi.

† This description is very faintly copied from a life of Gregory IX. cited by Odoricus Raynaldus; the following is a specimen: *Divinis missarum officiis reverenter expletis duplici diademate coronatus sub fulgoris specie in Cherubini transfiguratur aspectum, inter purpuratum venerabilium Cardinalium, Clericorum et Prælatorum comitivam innumeram, insignibus papalibus præcedentibus, equo in phaleris pretiosis evectus, per alme Urbis miranda mœnia Pater Urbis et Orbis deducitur admirandus. Hinc cantica concrepant, etc. etc.* See Pagi, Vit. Gregor. ix., s. iii. Fleury l. 79. s. 31. There seems no reason to believe, that these demonstrations of joy or ebullitions of adulation exceeded the customary parade of the thirteenth century.

tors and prefect of Rome were on foot at his side, holding his bridle—and thus was he conducted to the palace of the Lateran.

The first and immediate act of a pontificate so gorgeously undertaken, was to urge the renewal of the Crusades, both by persuasion and menace, at the various courts of Europe. The forces of Frederic were already collected at Otranto, and, if we are to believe some writers *, the Emperor did actually embark, and proceed on his destination as far as the narrow sea between the Morea and Crete, when a dangerous indisposition obliged him to return. It is at least certain, that he once more deferred the moment of his final departure. The Pope was infuriated; he treated the story of illness as an empty pretence, and without waiting or asking for excuse or explanation, instantly excommunicated the Emperor. This took place on the 29th of September, within six months from his elevation to the See; and the sword of discord, which was drawn on that day, had no secure or lasting interval of rest, until the deposition, or rather the death of Frederic.

The Emperor wrote several papers in his justification, and among them a letter to Henry III. of England, containing much severe and just reproach against the Roman Church. 'The Roman Church (such was the substance of his upbraiding) so burns with avarice that, as the ecclesiastical revenues do not content it, it is not ashamed to despoil sovereign Princes and make them tributary. You have a very touching example in your father King John; you have that also of the Count of Toulouse, and so many other princes whose kingdoms it holds under interdict, until it has reduced them to similar servitude. I speak not of the simonies, the unheard-of exactions, which it exercises over the clergy, the manifest or cloaked usuries with which it infects the whole world. In the mean time, these insatiable leeches use honied discourses, saying that the Court of Rome is the Church, our mother and nurse, while it is our stepmother and the source of every evil. It is known by its fruits. It sends on every side legates with power to punish, to suspend, to excommunicate; not to diffuse the word of God, but to amass money, and reap that which they have not sown †. And so they pillage churches, monasteries and other places of religion, which our fathers have founded for the support of pilgrims and the poor. And now these Romans, without nobility and without valour, inflated by nothing but their literature, aspire to kingdoms and empires. The Church was founded on poverty and simplicity, and no one can give it other foundation than that which Jesus Christ has fixed.' At the same time the Emperor continued to prepare for immediate departure, in spite of the sentence which hung over him. The Pope assembled a numerous Council, and thundered forth a second excommu-

* See Giannone, l. xvi. c. 6. Sigonio seguì la fede di Matteo Paris, il quale (ad ann. 1227, p. 286) scrisse: 'Animo nimis consternati in iisdem navibus quibus venerant plusquam 40 armatorum millia sunt reversi.' But this passage more probably relates to the numerous pilgrims, who had actually sailed to the Holy Land for the purpose of meeting Frederic, and who immediately returned on not finding him there. Fleury makes no mention of his having put to sea at all on this occasion; but Bzovius asserts — 'per triduum in mare proventus cursum convertit ac se neque maris jactationem neque incommodam valetudinem pati posse asseruit.' Ann. Eccles. ad ann. 1227.

† In 1229, Gregory IX. levied an exaction of tenths in England with so much severity, that even the standing crops were anticipated, and the bishops obliged to sell their property, or borrow money at a high interest, in order to answer the demand. Erat Papa tot et tantis involutus debitis, ut unde bellicam, quam susceperat, expeditionem sustineret, penitus ignorabat. Matth. Paris, anno citato. Mention is made of the continual, though secret, maledictions with which the Pope was pursued.

nication; and in the spring following, without making any humiliation, or obtaining any repeal of the anathema under which he lay, Frederic set sail for the Holy Land.

If there had been a shadow of sincerity in Gregory's professed enthusiasm for the liberation of Palestine,—if he had loved the name and birth-place of Christ with half the ardour with which he clung to his own papal and personal dignity, he would not have pursued the departed Emperor with his perverse malevolence, he would not have prostituted the ecclesiastical censures, to thwart his projects and blast his hopes. Yet he did so: his mendicant emissaries were despatched to the Patriarch and the military orders of Jerusalem, informing them of the sentence under which Frederic was placed, and forbidding them to act, or to communicate with him. At the same time, provoked, as some assert*, by a previous aggression from Frederic's lieutenant, he invaded with all his forces the Apulian dominions of the Emperor. Under these adverse circumstances, Frederic made a hasty, but not inglorious†, treaty with the Saracens, and instantly returned to the defence of his own kingdom—a measure which became the more necessary, since the Pope had issued a third excommunication, releasing his subjects from their oath of allegiance‡. We do not profess, in this peaceful narrative, to describe the details of military adventures, or to trace the perplexed and faithless politics of Italy. We must be contented to add, that some successes of the Emperor led to a hollow and fruitless reconciliation; that this again broke out (in the year 1238) into open war, which lasted till the death of the Pope, three years afterwards. The period of nominal peace had been disturbed by the constant complaints and recriminations§ of both parties. The perusal of those papers is sufficient to convince us, that if both had some, the Pope had the greater, share of blame; and while the style, which the prelate assumes, is that of an offended and injured protector and patron, the language of the Emperor, though never abject, frequently descends to the borders of querulousness and humility.

The cause of Frederic gained nothing by the death of Gregory, since he was succeeded by Innocent IV. || This extraordinary person (Sinibaldo Fieschi, a Genoese) had been distinguished as cardinal by his attachment to the person, if not to the cause, of the emperor; and on his election to the pontificate, the people of Italy indulged the fond and natural expectation, that the dissensions which blighted their happiness would at length be composed. Not so Frederic; for he was familiar with the soul of Innocent, and had read his insolent and implacable character. To his friends, who proffered their congratulations, he replied, that there was cause for sorrow rather than joy, since he had exchanged a cardinal, who was

* Fleury, l. 79, s. 43. Giannone, l. 16, c. 6.

† The possession of the City and of the Holy Sepulchre was secured to the Christians, while the Temple (now the Mosque of Omar) which had already been desecrated to the Mahometan worship, was left in the possession of the Saracens: a fair arrangement, which was misrepresented by the Pope and most ecclesiastical writers, and restored to history by Gibbon and Sismondi. Rep. Ital. chap. 15.

‡ The plea which he gave was 'because no one should observe fidelity to a man who is opposed to God and his Saints, and tramples upon his commandments.' A new maxim (as Fleury simply observes), and one which seems to authorize revolt.

§ These disputes are related at great length by Fleury, liv. 81, sect. 32, &c.

|| On June 24, 1243, Celestine IV., in fact, intervened, but died on the sixteenth day after his election.

his dearest friend, for a pope, who would be his bitterest enemy*. And so, indeed, it proved. On the occasion of an early and amicable conference, Innocent refused to withdraw his predecessor's excommunication, until Frederic should restore all that he was charged with having plundered from the Church. The meeting had no result; and Innocent presently repaired to France, and summoned a very numerous council at Lyons.

As soon as the members were assembled† (in 1245) Innocent, taking his throne, with Baldwin, emperor of the East, on his right hand, began the proceedings, by conferring the use of the red bonnet on his cardinals‡—to the end that they might never forget, in the use of that colour, that their blood was at all times due to the service of the Church. At the same time he adorned them with other emblems of dignity, in imitation of regal pomp and state, and in scorn (as it was thought) of a favourite expression of Frederic, that a Christian prelate ought to emulate the meekness and poverty of the disciples of Christ. He then opened his discourse respecting the defence of the Holy Land, and of other states at that time endangered by the Tartar invasion§, and concluded with some general reproaches on the character and conduct of Frederic,—that he had persecuted the pontiffs and other ministers of the Church of God; exiled and plundered the bishops; imprisoned the clergy, and even put many to a cruel death, with other similar charges. The same were repeated on the next day of meeting, and supported and exaggerated by the suspicious testimony of two partial and intemperate prelates. On both occasions they were boldly repelled by the emperor's ambassador, Taddeo di Suessa. After the delay of a fortnight, occasioned by an unfounded expectation of Frederic's appearance in person, the council assembled for the third time; and then, after premising some constitutions respecting the Holy Land, Innocent, 'to the astonishment and horror of all who heard him,' pronounced the final and fatal sentence against Frederic. He declared that prince deprived of the imperial crown, with all its honours and privileges, and of all his other states; he released his subjects from their oath; he even forbade their further obedience, on pain of excommunication, and commanded the electors to the empire to choose a successor. He presently recommended

* See Giannone, *Stor. di Nap.* lib. xvii., c. 3, and various authorities collected by Sismondi, *Rep. Ital.*, ch. xvi.

† See Giannone, lib. xvii., cap. 3. Sismondi, *Rep. Ital.*, ch. xvi.

‡ *Bov. Ann. Eccles.*, ad ann. 1245. Giannone, loc. cit. *Pagi. vit.*, Inn. IV., sec. xxxi., investigates the question whether this dignity was conferred at that time, or two years later.

§ Besides the affair of Frederic, to which our account in the text is nearly confined, the first General Council of Lyons professed three grand objects. (1.) To assist the Latin emperor of Constantinople against the Greeks. (2.) To aid the emperor of Germany against the Tartars. (3.) To rescue the Holy Land from the Saracens. For the attainment of the first of these objects, the Pope ordained a contribution of half the revenues of all benefices on which the incumbents were not actually resident, (a wholesome and admirable distinction,) placing a still higher impost on the largest; also of a tenth of the revenues of the Church of Rome. For the second, he exhorted the inhabitants to dig ditches, and build castles. For the third, he commanded the priests, and others in the Christian army, to offer up continual prayers, moving the Crusaders to repentance and virtue. Besides which he promised a twentieth part of the revenues of benefices for three years, and a tenth of those of the Pope and his cardinals. He likewise encouraged all who had the care of souls to influence the faithful to make donations by testament and otherwise. The decree touching the levies of money displeased many prelates, who openly opposed it, declaring that the Court of Rome now perpetually despoiled them under that pretext.

to that dignity Henry, Landgrave of Thuringia. For the kingdom of Sicily, he took upon himself, 'with the counsel of the cardinals, his brethren,' to provide a sovereign.

Frederic was at Turin when he received the news of this proceeding. He turned to the barons, who surrounded him, and, with deep indignation, addressed them. 'The pontiff *Deposition of Frederic:* has deprived me of the imperial crown—let us see if it be so.' He then ordered the crown to be brought to him, and placed it on his head, saying, 'that neither pope nor council had the power to take it from him.' Most of the princes of Europe were, indeed, of the same opinion, and continued to acknowledge him to the end of his life. And we may remark, that the usurpation of Innocent was in one respect marked with peculiar audacity,—he did not even plead the approbation of the Holy Council, but contented himself with proclaiming that the sentence had been pronounced *in its presence* *.

Nevertheless, his edict found willing obedience from the superstition or the turbulence of the German barons. Henry was supported by numerous partizans, and waged a prosperous warfare against Conrad, the son of Frederic; and on his early death, William, Count of Holland, was substituted by the Pope as a candidate for the throne. Innocent's genius and activity suggested to him the most refined arts to insure success, and his principles permitted him to adopt the most iniquitous. He even departed so far from the observance of humanity, and the most sacred feelings of nature, as to employ his intrigues to seduce Conrad from the service of his father, into rebellious and partial allegiance to the Church. That virtuous prince, rejecting, with firmness, the impious proposition, replied, that he would defend the side he had chosen to the last breath of life †; and neither the Pope nor the Church gained even a temporary advantage by an attempt which covers them with eternal infamy.

The same industrious hostility which had kindled rebellion among the German princes, was exerted with no less effect among the contentious states of Italy. The Guelphic interests were everywhere strengthened by the energy of Innocent; and the utmost efforts of Frederic were insufficient to restore tranquillity to Italy, or even to obtain any important triumphs over his Italian enemies. He died in Apulia, in the year 1250; and though he had never formally renounced the title of Emperor, his deposition was virtually *His death and character.* accomplished by the edict of Innocent, since the rest of his life was spent in uninterrupted confusion and alarm, in the midst of battle, and sedition, and treason, without any enjoyment of the repose of royalty, and with a very limited possession either of its dignity or authority. The character of Frederic has been vilified by Guelphic writers, and probably too highly exalted by the opposite faction. In the conduct of affairs purely temporal, he is celebrated for justice, magnificence, generosity, as well as for the patronage of arts and literature. Familiar with the use of many languages, and himself an author, he exhibited that disposition to cultivate science, and nourish every branch of knowledge, which is so seldom associated with great vices. In regard to his long and complicated contentions with the Church, it is unquestionably

* 'Sacro præsentis Concilio.' Bzovius (Ann. Eccles., ad ann. 1445) gives the precious document entire, prefaced, of course, with unqualified eulogy. Pagi, however, (Vit. Inn. IV., sec. xx.), argues, that the approbation of the Council was implied in its proceedings, if not actually expressed in the title of the sentence.

† Giannone, Stor. Nap., lib. xvii., ch. 4.

true that he violated, without any known necessity, certain solemn obligations respecting the time of commencing his Crusade. His reluctance to engage at all in such sanguinary and fruitless enterprises may be acknowledged and justified ; but his repeated breach of faith gave some reason to the Holy See for suspecting his subsequent promises. It is also true that he exiled some bishops, and imprisoned others, and even proceeded to greater extremities against some individuals of the inferior orders of the clergy ; and also that he levied contributions and imposts on all classes of his ecclesiastical subjects *. But those who felt his rigour may probably have deserved it by moral or political misconduct ; and it was just and legal † that the clergy should contribute some proportion to the support of the state. It may seem strange that, while his adversaries heap upon him the bitterest charges of impiety and blasphemy, his friends persist in asserting the unalterable fidelity and affection which he bore to his mother church, the protectress of his infancy ; that he was ever eager to advocate her cause, and promote her interests. In support of this singular pretension, it is advanced, that he was the inflexible and implacable extirpator of heresy. This fact, though urged by his admirers, is not disputed by his enemies. It is faithfully recorded, that at an early period (in 1224) he published three constitutions, which aggravated the guilt and punishments of heresy even beyond those of treason, and placed the temporal authorities at the disposal of the ecclesiastical inquisitors §. ‘ Those (he ordained) who have been arrested for heresy, and who, being moved by the fear of death, are desirous to return to the Church, shall be condemned to the penance of perpetual imprisonment. The judges shall be bound to seize the heretics discarded by the inquisitors of the holy See, or by others zealous for the Catholic faith, and to confine them closely until their execution, according to the sentence of the Church . . . We also condemn to death those who, having abjured to save their life, shall return into error. We deprive heretics, and all who abet them, of all benefit of appeal ; and it is our will that heresy be entirely banished from the whole extent of our empire. And as the crime which assails God is greater than that of treason, we ordain that the children of heretics, to the second generation, be deprived of all temporal benefits, and all public offices, unless they come forward and denounce their parents. ||’

Such were the measures by which an independent, and powerful, and

* Hence (says Giannone) probably arose the report, that he had commonly proclaimed his intention of reducing the clergy to primitive poverty ; ‘ so that Matthew Paris, who, before Frederic’s deposition, had always adhered to his party, as soon as he understood that such were his common expressions, as he was himself abbot of Monte Albano (St. Alban’s), in England, and wealthy and well beneficed, was displeased with such a proposition, and so began to change his style, and to write against him, in a manner different from his former.’ Stor. di Nap., lib. xvii., c. 4.

† Giannone proves that such had been the invariable custom, at least in the southern provinces of the empire of Frederic.

‡ One of these is the celebrated expression respecting the Three Impostors, then commonly attributed to Frederic, though solemnly and publicly denied by him. Another is a tale, recorded by certain monks, that, when they requested him to spare their crop of wheat, Frederic commanded his soldiers ‘ to desist, and to respect those ears of corn, since some day the grains which they contained might become so many Christs.’ Giannone, loc. cit., on authority of Simon Hanh, Hist. Germ. in Frederico II.

§ Several authors assert that, in virtue of a promise made to Innocent III., he established a permanent Inquisition in Sicily in the year 1213. Stor. di Nap. loc. cit. This, however, is scarcely probable, for the Inquisition was not at that time permanently established even at Toulouse.

|| Fleury, Hist. Eccl., lib. lxxviii., sec. lxxv.

(for those days) an enlightened monarch, evinced his affection for the Church of Rome! Such were the favours by which he courted her friendship, and sought to merit her gratitude! by feeding her fiercest passion—by sanctioning the most fatal of all her evil principles. It is true that Frederic may thus have established some claims on the sympathy of the furious zealots of his time; but his indulgence to those churchmen was no deed of friendship to the Church. To protect and foster the vices of a system, is to prevent its permanence, and poison its prosperity; and if ever, during his long reign, he appeared as the real friend of Rome, it was the time when he least professed that name—at the time when he exposed her abuses, and proclaimed her shame, and called upon her to repent and amend. And assuredly, when he lent his obsequious sword to swell the catalogue of her crimes, he was already preparing for his latter years the tempest which disturbed and tormented them; nor did it happen without the spirit of God, that his calamities were inflicted by that same hand, whose darkest atrocities had been approved and directed by himself.

It is strange, too, that among the four reasons by which the Pope justified his sentence of deposition, it was one, that Frederic had rendered himself *guilty of heresy*, by his contempt of pontifical censures, and his unholy alliance with the Saracens. Thus, then, did that prince, according to the strict letter of his own constitutions, become liable, on his condemnation by the Church, to the monstrous penalties contained in them.

Another*, perhaps a more plausible reason, was this,—that he had been deficient in that fidelity, which he owed to the Pope, as his vassal for the kingdom of Sicily; for that claim, however absurd in origin and principle, had been previously asserted and acknowledged. But, in truth, when we compare the character and causes of this second conflict between the Church and the Empire with those which marked the contest of Henry with Gregory VII. and his successors, we find it much more difficult to discover what was the specific and tangible ground of quarrel. In the former instance there existed one grand and definite object, for which both parties perseveringly struggled; in the latter, many vague complaints and indeterminate offences were advanced and retorted; but no single great principle was avowedly contested, nor was any one additional right or privilege acquired or confirmed to the Church by its final triumph. Only the power and influence of Rome were made more manifest; and other nations were taught to tremble at the omnipotence of the double sword.

This leads us to remark another distinction—that, in the contest with Henry, it was, in reality, the *Church* of Rome which rose in opposition to the empire—the spiritual, or, at least, the ecclesiastical, interests of the See were those most consulted and most prominent in the debate. In that with Frederic, it was rather from the *Court* of Rome, that the spirit and motives of policy proceeded. In the former case, the material sword was introduced as secondary and subsidiary to the spiritual; but in the latter, if the contrary was not actually the case †, at least the two weapons were

* See Sismondi, Rep. Ital., ch. xvi.

† In the year 1251, Christianus, (or Conrad,) Archbishop of Mentz, was actually deposed by Innocent, for reluctance to use arms in the defence of the Church. 'He said, that the works of war did not become the sacerdotal character; but that he was ever willing to use the sword of the spirit, which was the word of God. The Scriptures had

so dexterously substituted and interchanged for each other—the one was so continually presented under the holy semblance of the other—as to show the proficiency which the See had latterly made in the art of deluding the human race.

Again—the avarice or the necessities of Rome compelled her, during these disputes, to a measure which, however expedient at the moment, was finally very injurious to her—that of levying taxes rigidly and generally upon the clergy. It was not in England only (though there most successfully*) that Gregory IX. exacted from all ranks of ecclesiastics the tenth of their moveables immediately on his breach with the emperor; and every one recollects with what repugnance his second requisition (in 1240) was admitted by our clerical forefathers. From the moment that the Pope was found so infatuated as to publish a *Crusade*† against a Catholic emperor, and to feed his own temporal ambition by despoiling his faithful Catholic clergy, the minds of all reasonable laymen were startled and revolted by the former outrage, while the hearts of the clergy, being touched by the injustice of the latter, began gradually to close against so rapacious a protector.

When Innocent received the news of the death of Frederic, his exultation broke forth without restraint or moderation; *Conduct of Innocent.* —‘Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be in festivity; for the thunder and the tempest with which a powerful God has so long threatened your heads, are changed by the death of that man into refreshing breezes and fertilizing dews‡.’

commanded him to put his sword in the sheath.’ Of this offence (and no other charge is mentioned) he was accused by the king and certain of the laity before the Pope, and was immediately degraded from his See. Pagi, Innoc. IV., sec. xlvii.

* The pages of Matthew Paris abound with instances of pontifical rapacity and insolence. See *ad annos* 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1250, 1252, &c. . . Sometimes a legate à latere was the instrument; sometimes the Mendicants acted as tax-gatherers; and even Ireland did not escape their visitations. In 1247, the complaints both of the French and English clergy assumed a formidable shape for that age. The lasting effect was, that the former devotion to Rome was turned into ‘execrable odium et maledictiones occultas.’ For all both saw and felt that the Pope was insatiable in his extortions, to their great loss and impoverishment. And there were many who began to question whether he had really received from heaven the power of St. Peter to bind and to loose, seeing how very unlike he was to that apostle. ‘Resolutum est igitur os iniqua loquentium, &c.’ . . and this as well in France as in England.

† The same indulgences were promised to those who armed against the emperor as against the sultan; and the apostolic preachers, under Innocent at least, even pointed out the former as the easier and broader road to salvation. Sismondi, Rep. Ital., chap. xvi. Fleury, Hist. Eccl., lib. lxxxiii., sec. xxxiii. The nobility of France, and the Queen Blanche, were highly offended by this measure of Innocent, during the Crusade of St. Louis. ‘The Pope (they complained) is preaching a new Crusade against Christians for the extension of his own dominions, and forgets the king, our master, who is suffering so much for the faith.’ ‘Let the Pope (the queen replied) keep those who go into his service; and let them depart, never to return.’ The nobles also reprimanded the Mendicants who had preached this Crusade. ‘We build for you churches and houses: we receive, nourish, and entertain you. What good does the Pope for you? He fatigues and torments you; he makes you his tax-gatherers, and renders you hateful to your benefactors.’ They excused themselves on the plea of the obedience due to him. . . Here we discover the elements of the Gallican liberties.

‡ In a similar spirit of Christian forgiveness, the same Pope is related to have expressed his exultation at the death of Grosstete, bishop of Lincoln. ‘I rejoice; and let every true son of the Church rejoice with me—that my great enemy is removed.’ . . . Assuredly that admirable prelate had gone very far in disaffection, not hesitating to denounce Innocent, almost with his dying breath, as Antichrist; ‘For by what other name are we to designate that power, which labours to destroy the souls that Christ came to save?’

It was thus that he addressed the clergy of Sicily, while, at the same time, he prepared to reduce that province, together with the kingdom of Naples, under his own immediate government, and attach it in perpetuity to the dominions of the Church. In pursuance of this project, he quitted Lyons, his constant residence * during the uncertainties of the war, and visited, in a sort of triumphal procession, the Guelphic cities of Italy. He was everywhere received with an enthusiasm which he had not merited by any regard for any interests except his own; and he is even supposed somewhat to have chilled the misplaced gratitude of his allies by the unexpected assertion of some spiritual pretensions over themselves. In Sicily, and the south of Italy, he succeeded in creating a powerful party; but it was overthrown by the arms of Conrad and Manfred, the sons of Frederic. Foiled by force, the Pope had recourse to intrigue; and he began to treat successively with the kings of England and France, with a view to bestow the crown of the Sicilies on a branch either of the one family or the other. In the meantime, the death of Conrad revived in him the expiring hope of uniting it to his own. Ambition resumed her sway; and he broke off the imperfect negotiations. The kingdom of Naples was again thronged with his emissaries; seditions were in every quarter excited in his favour; and even Manfred himself, in the belief that resistance would be vain, advanced to the frontiers to offer his submission, and deigned to lead by the bridle the horse of the pontiff as he crossed the Garigliano.

This event, which seemed to secure to the Court of Rome the throne of Naples and Sicily, and thus to extend its dominions beyond any limits which it had at any time reached, or, till lately, aspired to; took place in the summer of 1254. The duration of this unnatural prosperity was even shorter than could have been predicted by the most penetrating statesman; for before the conclusion of the very same year, Manfred had again possessed himself of the keys of the kingdom. But Innocent did not live to witness this second reverse;—he had already expired † at Naples, in mature old age, and in the confident persuasion that he had achieved the dearest object of his ambition, and that he died the most powerful prince who had ever filled the throne of St. Peter.

During a pontificate of eleven years and five months, he had displayed

* On the departure of the Pope from Lyons, the Cardinal Hugo made a valedictory address to all the population of both sexes; and it contained the following sentence:—*'Amici, magnam fecimus, postquam in hac Urbem venimus, utilitatem et eleemosynam. Quando enim primo huc venimus, tria vel quattuor prostibula invenimus. Sed nunc recedentes unum solum relinquimus. Verum ipsum durat continuatum ab orientali parte civitatis usque ad occidentalem.'* This is related as fact by Matthew Paris. Ad ann. 1251.

† Soon after Innocent's death, (of which the exact day, it is proper to remark, is disputed—Pagi, Inn. IV., sec. lxxv.) a cardinal had the following vision. He saw a noble matron, on whose brow the word *Ecclesia* was written, present her petition at the Judgment-seat, saying, *Justissime Judex, justè judica.* She then brought forward these charges against Innocent IV. (1.) At the foundation of the Church, Thou didst give it liberties proceeding from Thyself; but he has made it the vilest of slaves, (ancillam vilissimam). (2.) It was founded to benefit the souls of the miserable;—he has made it a table of money-gatherers. (3.) It was founded in Faith, Justice, and Truth;—but he has staggered Faith, destroyed Justice, and clouded Truth. *Justum ergo judicium redde mihi.* Then the Lord said to him, Go and receive thy reward according to thy merits. And thus he was carried away. The cardinal then woke, through the terror of this sentence, and shouted so loud, as to excite the suspicion of insanity. *Ista visio* (continues Matthew Paris) *(nescitur si fantastica) multos perterruit; et utinam cum effectu castigas emendavit.* That it was generally propagated, and perhaps believed at the time, is sufficient to prove to us (if we needed indirect proof) what was the sort of reputation which Innocent IV. possessed among his contemporaries.

all the qualities which consummate an artful politician, and which disgrace a bishop and a Christian. As a statesman, he designed daringly, he negotiated skillfully, he intrigued successfully; he perfectly comprehended the means at his disposal, and adapted them so closely to his purposes, that his reign presented a series of those triumphs * which are usually designated glorious. As a churchman, he bade defiance to the best principles of his religion; he set at nought the common feelings of humanity. The spiritual guide to eternal life, he had no fixed motive of action, except vulgar temporal ambition. 'The servant of the servants of God,' he rejected with scorn the humiliation of Frederic †, and spurned a suppliant emperor, who had been his friend. And lastly, when the infant son of Conrad was presented to his tutelary protection by a dying father, the prayer was haughtily refused; and 'the father of all Christians, and the protector of all orphans,' hastened to usurp the hereditary rights of a Christian child and orphan. These circumstances duly considered, with every allowance for times and prejudices, seem, indeed, almost to justify the expression of the sultan of Egypt, in his answer to a letter of Innocent—the taunt of a Mussulman addressed to Christ's vicar upon earth;—'We have received your epistle, and listened to your envoy: he has spoken to us of Jesus Christ—whom we know better than you know, and whom we honour more than you honour him ‡.'

Alexander IV. succeeded to the chair, to the passions, and to the projects of Innocent; and it was the leading object of his reign of six years to maintain or recover the temporal possession of the kingdom of Manfred. But he possessed neither the firmness of character nor the various talents necessary for success. The machine, which had not always moved obediently even to the hand of Innocent, seemed to lose, in his feebleness, all the elasticity of its action; and it became evident, before the end of his pontificate, that the sceptre of Naples and Sicily was not destined to a bishop of Rome. At the same time, Alexander was celebrated for the exercise of some of those virtues, which were not found in his predecessor—for earnestness of piety, or, at least, for assiduity in prayer, and the strict observance of Church regulations §. The favours which he bestowed upon the Mendicant orders will prove his zeal, indeed, rather than the wisdom of his policy. But the Crusade which he preached, from whatsoever motive, against Eccelino, the tyrant, was almost justified

* We should mention, however, that the fall of Frederic is not wholly attributable to Innocent's influence. A very strong republican and anti-imperial spirit previously prevailed in many, especially the northern, cities of Italy, which the Pope could not have created, though he very well knew how to avail himself of it. Another remark we may here make—that Innocent was much more successful in fomenting seditions, and making parties in foreign states, than in securing the subordination of his own capital. There were few cities in Italy where he had less influence than at Rome; which may account for his continual absence from it. See Sismondi, Rep. Ital., chap. xviii. Matthew Paris, Hist. Angliæ, ann. 1254.

† Sismondi, Rep. Ital., chap. xvii.

‡ De quo Christo plus scimus quam vos sciatis, et magnificamus eum plusquam vos magnificatis. Bzov., Ann. Eccles., ad ann. 1264. Matthew Paris, Hist. ad ann. eundem. The letter is a very sensible composition, and deals very directly with the subjects on which it treats.

§ Alexander IV. is thus characterised by Matthew Paris;—Satis benignus et bene religiosus; assiduus in orationibus, in abstinentia strenuus, sed sibilis adulantium seducibilis et pravis avarorum suggestionibus inclinitivus. Pagi is very much offended by the qualification of the praise.

by the crimes of that miscreant ; for though a war proclaimed ' in the name of God ' is, in most instances, only wickedness cloaked by blasphemy, yet we may view it with some indulgence, when it is directed against the convicted enemy of mankind.

For the seven following years (from 1261 to 1268) the chair was occupied by two Frenchmen, Urban IV. and Clement IV., who have obtained an eminent place in civil as well as *Urban IV. and Clement IV.* ecclesiastical history, by the introduction of Charles of Anjou to the throne of Naples. Whether from personal hostility to the actual occupant of that throne, or from ecclesiastical rancour against the son of Frederic, or from a political determination to cut off all connexion between the south of Italy and the empire, or from all these causes united, the holy See, by whomsoever administered, did not remit or relax its exertions for the expulsion of Manfred. The negotiations with the court of France, which Innocent IV. had commenced and interrupted, were renewed and concluded by Urban IV. ; and during the following reign of Clement, the Crusade against a legitimate and virtuous monarch was completed with the most sanguinary success. The brother of St. Louis supported his usurpation by the same merciless sword which had achieved it ; and the historians of Italy still recount, with tears of indignation, the more than usual horrors of the French invasion.

But, however strong this Pope's nationality may have been, it did not cause him to forget his papal interests. The conditions which he exacted from Charles, on investing him with the crown of Naples, contained most of the claims then in dispute between kings and popes, such as the unqualified appointment to vacant sees, the exclusive care of the temporalities during vacancy, and even the abolition of all pretensions rising from the regalia*.

On the death of Clement, the See was vacant, through the disunion of the cardinals, for nearly three years. At length, in 1273, an Italian, a native of Piacenza, was elected, and assumed *Gregory X.* the name of Gregory X.—' a person (says Fleury †) of little learning, but of great experience in secular affairs, and more given to the distribution of alms, than the amassing of riches.' He was in the Holy Land at the time of his appointment ; and as he returned with a keen and recent impression of its sufferings, and with an enthusiasm freshly kindled by that spectacle, the first act of his pontificate was directed to the revival of the crusading ardour ; and the same continued to the end of his life to be the favourite object of his exertions. He was successful, because he was sincere. Those, who cared not for his reasoning, listened to his disinterested supplications ; those who were not inflamed by his enthusiasm, still respected and loved it. It was no longer against a Christian sectarian, or a Catholic Emperor and his

* See Giannone, Stor. di Nap., lib. xix., cap. v. In a Bull, dated in 1266, he declared that the disposition of all benefices rightfully belonged to the Pope. The claims of the princes were supported by a decree of the Council of Lyons. See Dupin, Siècle xiii., sec. x. That author observes generally that commendams of benefices, and the distinction between simple benefices and those with cure of souls, were the introduction of this age ; and that the jurisdiction, privileges, and immunities of the clergy, were thus extended as far as possible. Pluralities were strictly prohibited, and commonly enjoyed. On the other hand, ecclesiastics were compelled to contribute, not only to the real or pretended necessities of the church, but frequently, under one pretext or other, to the exigencies of the state. Hence their murmurs and discontent. The possession and enjoyment was the habit and the right—the contribution was novel and vexatious.

† Hist. Eccl., lib. lxxxvi. sec. xvii.

persecuted race, that the monarchs of Europe were called upon to arm; it was no longer for the peculiar aggrandizement of the Court or Church of Rome, that the father of Christians summoned them to battle; they had already learnt to distinguish between the interests of the Vatican and the honour of Christ; and the magic which a spiritual Pope had so long exercised over the human mind, lost much of its fascination and power, as soon as he degenerated into a temporal prince.

But Gregory X. had higher and less ambiguous claims on the gratitude of Christendom than any zeal for the deliverance of Palestine could possibly give him. He laboured to compose the dissensions of his distracted country; to heal the wounds which had been so wantonly inflicted by the selfish ambition of his predecessors. He interposed, impartially, and therefore not vainly, to reconcile the opposite factions of Guelphs and Ghibelines*; and exhibited to them the new and venerable spectacle of a pacific Pope. He interposed too in the affairs of the empire; but it was again for the purpose of terminating a division which threatened the peace of Germany; and he proved the sincerity of his intention by confirming the election of Rodolph, who had secured and deserved the affections of his people. Another project, on which he was bent with like earnestness, had the same respectable character,—the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin Churches; and in this difficult affair he also obtained a complete (though very transient) success, by the concessions of the Emperor Michael, and the temporary or nominal submission of his Church.

It was at the second Council of Lyons, that the deputies of the East presented their faithless homage to the Roman pontiff. But that prelate had two other, and, perhaps, dearer objects, in the summoning of that vast assembly†. The one was to complete the preparations for this long-projected Crusade; the other was the worthier of his wisdom, and even of his piety—to reform the obnoxious abuses of his Church. In the course of the six sessions of the Council, thirty-one constitutions were enacted for the better administration of the Church, and they did honour at least to the intentions of those who promulgated them. Some eight or ten of these related to the election of bishops; several others to cures and benefices, to the discipline or temporalities of the Church. Another (the 21st) was levelled against the unlimited

* Leonardus Aretinus (Histor. Florent. lib. iii. p. 48, edit. Argent, 1610) bears ample testimony to the sanctity and pacific character of Gregory, and details the circumstances of his attempt to reconcile parties at Florence. The following is given as part of his address to the citizens:—*Quæ est igitur hæc tam præpotens causa? Quod Guelphus est (inquit) aut Gibellinus—nomina ne ipsis quidem qui illa proferunt nota!*—*Ea nimirum causa est. cur cives necantur, domus incenduntur, evertitur patria, sititur proximi sanguis. Oh puerilem stultitiam! oh amentiam non ferendam! Gibellinus est—at Christianus, at civis, at proximus, at consanguineus. Ergo hæc tot et tam valida conjunctionis nomina Gibellinis succumbent?* Et id unum atque inane nomen (nam quid significet nemo intelligit) plus valebit ad odium, quam ista omnia tam præclara et tam solida et expressa ad caritatem, &c. These sentiments (the historian adds) were grateful to the multitude, but displeased the aristocracy. The Pope was then obliged to lay the city under an interdict; and his admirable intentions involved him in an obstinate contest with the nobles. But any doubts which might still remain respecting his sanctity were removed (as Leonardus gravely asserts) by the numerous miracles performed at his tomb.

† Five hundred bishops, seventy mitred abbots, and a thousand inferior clergy and theologians composed this Council, assembled in 1274. The legates of Michael the Greek Emperor, and of the King of the Tartars were present. Also the ambassadors of France, Germany, England, Sicily, &c., and one Prince, James of Arragon. Pagi, Greg. x., s. xxv.

growth of Mendicant orders; disbanding all, which had not formally received the papal confirmation, and discouraging the foundation of others. But that among the acts of this assembly, which was at the time the most celebrated, and perhaps in effect the most permanent, was the law which regulated the method of papal election, by severe restraints imposed upon the conclave*. It was then enacted, that the cardinals should be lodged in one chamber, without any separation of wall or curtain, or any issue—that the chamber should be so closed on every side, as to leave no possibility of entrance or exit. ‘No one shall approach them or address them privately, unless with the consent of all present, and on the business of the election. The conclave (properly the name of the chamber) shall have one window, through which necessary food may be admitted, without there being space for the human body to enter. And if (which God forbid) in three days after their entrance they shall not yet have come to a decision, for the fifteen following days they shall be contented with a single dish, as well for dinner as for supper. But after these fifteen days they shall have no other nourishment than bread, wine and water, until the election shall be made. During the election, they shall receive nothing from the apostolical chamber, nor any other revenues of the Roman Church.’

The expedition to Palestine gave promise of the most favourable issue. The Emperor Rodolph had engaged to conduct it; Philip the Hardy, King of France, Edward *Intended Crusade, and* of England, James of Arragon, and Charles of *Death of Gregory.* Sicily, had pledged their faith to attend it: supplies had been secured by the universal imposition of a tax on Ecclesiastical property; and the following year was devoted to the necessary preparations. At the end of that year †, before one galley had departed, or perhaps one soldier embarked, the Pope himself fell sick and died. From that moment (says Sismondi) the kings into whom he had inspired his enthusiasm, renounced their chivalrous projects; the Greeks returned to their schisms, and the Catholics, divided afresh, turned against each other those arms which they had consecrated to the deliverance of Palestine.

The short reigns of Innocent V., Adrian V. and John XXI., were not distinguished by any memorable event. Nicholas III., a Roman of the family of the Ursini, succeeded in *Nicholas III.* 1277, and devoted himself with great prudence and success, not so much to enlarge the temporal edifice of his church, as to secure the foundations on which it stood. For that purpose he resumed some negotiations, commenced by Gregory X. at Lyons, with Rodolph, King of the Romans, and brought them to so fortunate a termination, that that prince finally satisfied all the donations of preceding Emperors, and recognized the cities of the ecclesiastical states, as being absolutely independent of himself, and owing their entire allegiance to the Pope. Nicholas had another object of jealousy in the increasing power of Charles, King of Sicily, and he had the address ‡ to engage that prince

* Pagi, Vit. Greg. X. sect. xli. Fleury, liv. lxxxvi., sect. xlv. It was quite obvious that, as men and cardinals are constituted, these regulations could not be enforced rigorously. But with some modifications they subsist even to this moment.

† In January, 1278.

‡ The art with which he played off the Emperor and King of Sicily against each other, until he obtained all that he required from both, was worthy of the most refined ages of papal diplomacy. See Sismondi, Rep. Ital. chap. xxii. ann. 1277, 1278.

to resign two very important dignities, which he had probably acquired through the subservience of Clement IV. One was the office of Imperial Vicar-general in Tuscany; the other was that of Senator of Rome. We have already had occasion to mention the inefficacy of the Pope's civil authority in his own capital; and this had lately been subjected even to additional insult by the frequent appointment of foreigners to the highest offices. Pope Nicholas published a constitution to prevent the recurrence of this evil, and to limit the time of possession to one year.

It is worth remarking, that, in defence of his temporal sovereignty, as well over the states, as over the city, of Rome, he appealed to the immoveable foundations on which he conceived them to rest. In favour of the first, he pleaded the donations of Lewis the Meek, and the confirmations of Otho I. and St. Henry*; in favour of the second, the 'Donation of Constantine'; and he maintained, that the temporal power of the Pope and his Cardinals was absolutely necessary for the free exercise of their spiritual functions. He reigned only two years and nine months: he is commonly described as possessing many good qualities; and we read of no other serious charge against him, than that he heaped upon his greedy relatives and connexions the most splendid benefices of the church, with unmerited and shameless profusion.

The King of Sicily was successful in procuring the election of a Frenchman, Martin IV., who is chiefly remarkable in history *Martin IV.* for his entire subservience to the interests of his patron.

In violation of both the clauses of the constitution of Nicholas, he accepted the office of Senator, and held it for life. As this was the first instance of such condescension on the part of St. Peter's successors, it has not escaped the notice of the historian. And if indeed the claims on the temporal sovereignty of Rome, which they had asserted for above two centuries, had been well founded, it would have been a strange and unprecedented degradation for a sovereign prince to exercise a simple magistracy in his own city†. But Martin was probably less disposed to examine the remote and general question of right, than to avail himself of the substantial power thus firmly vested in his own person.

He enjoyed his dignity for a very short time, though sufficient to make him witness of the 'Sicilian Vespers,' and the misfortunes of his countrymen. He was buried in the Church of St. Lawrence, and many sick were healed at his tomb, in the presence of vast numbers of the clergy and laity,—according to the evidence of a contemporary author, who affirms that those miracles still lasted while he was writing, which was six weeks after the decease of the pontiff‡. The mention of these impostures is so common, even in the pages of the most enlightened Catholic historians, that we are not justified in passing them over in entire silence. In fact, they formed so essential a part of the Roman Catholic system, that we should do injustice to its whole character, if we were not occasionally to notice them.

* Fleury, liv. lxxxvii., sect. xv. and xvi.

† Sismondi (chap. xxii.) asserts that he immediately transferred his dignity to Charles, following Jordanus, apud Raynaldum, and other authorities. The words of the appointment sufficiently express the extent of the power conferred. 'Nobiles viri . . . Electores ordinati . . . domino Martino Papæ IV. unanimiter et concorditer transtulerunt et plenarie commiserunt regimen senatus Urbis, ejusque territorii et districtus toto tempore vitæ suæ: et dederunt sibi plenam et liberam potestatem regendi toto tempore Urbem . . . per se, vel per alium, vel per alios, et eligendi senatorem, vel senatores,' &c. &c.

‡ Fleury, liv. lxxxviii., sect. xvi. Both Martin and his predecessor were extremely attached to the Franciscan Order.

Martin was succeeded by a noble Roman, Honorius IV.; and he by another native of the Roman states, Nicholas IV., who was elected in 1288. The claims of this Pope on historical notice, are confined to some diligent but almost hopeless exertions to excite the princes of Europe to another Crusade; and to some as zealous and as fruitless efforts for the extirpation of heresy. In 1288, he stimulated his Mendicant emissaries to peculiar diligence both in Italy and Provence, and put in practice a somewhat singular method for securing the orthodoxy of his people*. He obliged the converted heretic to be bound in a pecuniary recognizance against relapse, and to find sufficient securities for payment. Avarice was scarcely become even yet the ruling passion of the Vatican; but since the sway of Innocent III., it had been rapidly gaining ground; and the edict of Nicholas gives fearful indications of its progress. In the year following, an ordinance was published at Venice, for the purpose of facilitating the operations of the Inquisition; and it was approved and confirmed by the pontiff.

Nicholas died soon afterwards; and the history of his successor is distinguished by so many strange circumstances from the ordinary annals of papal biography, that it may afford relief as well as advantage to unfold its particulars. Through the disunion of the cardinals, the See had already been vacant for seven-and-twenty months, and no progress seemed yet to have been made towards the decision. They were still assembled in conclave, and still without any prospect of immediate accommodation, when, on some day in the beginning of July, 1294, one of their number was prevented from attending the deliberation by the sudden and violent death of his brother. By this casual occurrence, the thoughts of the venerable society were directed to man's mortality; and their reflexions assumed a serious and solemn character. *Election of Pietro di Morone, or Celestine V.* At length, returning to the subject before them, the bishop of Tusculum asked with vehemence, 'Why then delay we so long to give a head to the Church? whence this division among us?' To which Cardinal Latino added, 'It has been revealed to a holy man, that unless we hasten to the election of a Pope, in less than four months the anger of God will burst upon us.' Hereupon, Benedict Gaetano, (the same who was afterwards Boniface VIII.) sarcastically smiled and said, 'It is brother Pietro di Morone, to whom that revelation has been vouchsafed?' Latino answered, 'The same; he has written to me that, when engaged in his nocturnal devotions before the altar, he had received the command of God to communicate this warning.' Then the cardinals began to discourse of what they knew concerning that holy man. One dwelt on the austerity of his life, another on his virtues, another on his miracles: presently some one proposed *him* as a candidate for the See; and a discussion immediately arose on that question.

The debate was of very short duration, for reason had given place to passionate emotion, and passion was mistaken for inspiration. Cardinal Latino first gave his suffrage for Pietro di Morone: his example was eagerly followed by his colleagues, and the sudden and ardent unanimity of the conclave was attributed to the immediate impulse of the divinity†.

* The idea was not original. Instructions to the same effect were given to the Minorites by Alexander IV. in 1258. It was then provided, that the money so raised should be employed in the prosecution of heretics.

† A suspicious historian would perhaps except Benedict Gaetano from the charge of superstitious enthusiasm. Possibly even then he proposed to profit by the weaknesses of

Its choice had fallen upon a weak and aged recluse, whose life had been devoted to the most rigorous observances of superstition, and whose inveterate habits of solitary meditation disqualified him for the commonest offices of society. His very name was derived from the mountain top where his existence had passed away. The cave in which he dwelt had been the refuge of a dragon, who obsequiously resigned it to his human successor; and we are seriously assured, that his infancy had been the object of that miraculous agency, which he so profusely exercised in his later years; and that even at his entrance into this polluted world, he was protected by the semblance, or the reality, of the monastic habit*.

The deputies proceeded to announce to him the astounding change in his fortune. They arrived at the city of Sulmone, and having received permission to present themselves, ascended with toil and sweat the narrow and rugged path, which led through a desolate wilderness to the cell they sought. The cell was closed against them, and they were compelled to make their communication through a small grated window. Through the interstices they beheld a pale old man, attenuated with fasting and macerations, with a beard disshevelled and eyes inflamed with tears, trembling with the agitation into which the awful announcement had thrown him. The Archbishop of Lyons then assured him of the enthusiasm which had united the Cardinals in his favour; and pressed him, by accepting the dignity, to compose the troubles of the Church. Pietro answered, 'I must consult God—go and pray likewise.' He then prostrated himself on the earth, and after remaining some time in supplication, he rose and said, 'I accept the pontificate, I consent to the election—I dare not resist the will of God, I will not be wanting to the Church in her necessity.' No sooner was the result of this interview bruited abroad, than the sides of Mt. Morone were frequented by assiduous visitants, whom piety, or interest, or curiosity conducted to the cavern of the hermit-pope. Churchmen and laymen of every rank hastened to pay homage to his virtues or his dignity; and his earliest levee was adorned by the presence of two kings†.

It was immediately discovered that the qualifications of Celestine V. (Pietro assumed that name) fell far short even of the ordinary limits of monastic capacity. He was entirely ignorant of all science and all literature; even the Latin language was nearly strange to him; against the comprehension of worldly matters his eyes were closed by perpetual seclusion, and his blindness was confirmed by old age; his simplicity tempted and rewarded deception, and he was guilty of the most extraordinary errors in the discharge of his easiest duties. Besides this, he brought with him from his cell and his convent (for he had been the founder of a new Order

Pietro; but he could scarcely have considered them as the object of God's especial interposition; or have believed that an old man, who had not hitherto filled any office in society, had been selected by the especial favour of Providence to occupy the highest.

* All these fables are sedulously and solemnly related by Bzovius. *Manebat matrix fixum quod nascenti olim filio contigerat, ac tanquam magnum aliquod divinumque portendebat. Ex utero siquidem materno exierit circumamictus indumento quodam, quod nihil ab his quibus religiosi homines vestiuntur, differrebat.* Ad ann. 1294.

† Charles le Boiteux of Sicily, and his son Charles Martel, titular Prince of Hungary. The Pope elect descended to Aquila to assume his pontificals, on an ass, and the two princes held the bridle.

*Intumidus vilem Murro conscendit assellum,
Regum fræna manu dextra lævaque regente
Pontificis. . .*

Might there not in this act be some of that 'Humility which spurs the Divinity?'

of Monks, distinguished for their illiterate vulgarity) a disaffection towards the higher ranks of the secular clergy, which was not, perhaps, without reason; and a contempt for their luxuries and abhorrence for their vices, which formed the holiest feature in his character. It was probably this disposition, which endeared him to the laity, as well as to many among the regular clergy; and no doubt it was the alienation from his own official counsellors, which subjected him too obsequiously to the influence of the king of Sicily. For under this influence he was assuredly acting, when, without any foresight of the inevitable consequences of the measure, he added to the college of Cardinals seven natives of France.

These were circumstances sufficient to excite the dissatisfaction of that body, and their suspicions respecting the nature of the spirit which had decided their choice. They professed apprehensions, which were not wholly unreasonable, lest, by some new imprudence, the Pope should compromise or concede the inviolable rights of the Church.—They disliked the frugal severity of his Court; they complained with justice, that he preferred an obscure residence in the kingdom of Naples to the Holy and Imperial City; and the bitterness of their displeasure was completed, when he revived, in all its rigour, the obnoxious constitution of Gregory X. respecting the manner of papal election.

In the mean time, Celestine had discovered his own disqualifications and his inability to correct them. Amidst the incessant toil of occupations which he disliked and dignities which he despised, he sighed for the tranquillity of his former solitude; and then, that his pious meditations might not wholly be discontinued, he caused a cell to be constructed in the centre of his palace, whither he frequently retired to prayer. On such occasions, he sometimes gave vent to his deep disquietude. 'I am told that I possess all power over souls in this world—why is it then that I cannot assure myself of the safety of mine own? that I cannot rid myself of all these anxieties, and impart to my own breast that repose, which I can dispense so easily to others? Does God require from me that which is impossible; or has he only raised me in order to cast me down more terribly? I observe the Cardinals divided; and I hear from every side complaints against me. Is it not better to burst my chains, and resign the holy See to some one who can rule it in peace?—if only I could be permitted to quit this place and return to my solitude!'

Several of the Cardinals having observed that disposition, were sedulous to encourage it. It was entirely in accordance with their general wishes, with that most especially of *His Resignation*. Benedict Gaetano; since he designed himself for the successor. Those, on the other hand, who profited by Celestine's simplicity, or revered his piety, or admired his popular austerities, dissuaded him from so unprecedented a project. But the good man was sincere and inflexible*; and after tasting for only five months of the bitterness of power, he pronounced his solemn resignation† of the pontificate.

* Ezerovius describes his ardour for abdication, by the strong expression, 'that no one ever accepted office so eagerly as he resigned it.' That writer (if we could forget the miraculous absurdities which overload his narrative) has described this curious episode in papal history more fairly than Mosheim; for the latter overlooks the old hermit's absolute incapacity, in a partial eagerness to attribute the discontent of his clergy to the consciousness of their own vices, and the fear of a rigorous reformation—though that may unquestionably have been one of their motives.

† 'I, Celestine V., moved by sufficient causes—by humility, by the desire of a better

Thus far his vows were accomplished without any obstruction. But he last aspirations of his prayer were not accorded, nor was it given him again to breathe the peaceful breezes of Mt. Morone. The shadow of his dignity continued to haunt him after he had cast away the substance; the man who had possessed the chair of St. Peter, and abdicated it, could not possibly descend to insignificance or rise to independence. The merit of resigning a throne was insufficient to atone for the imprudence of accepting it; and Celestine was condemned for the remainder of his days to strict confinement by the jealousy of Boniface*.

As the pontificate of Boniface VIII. is the hinge on which the subsequent history of papacy almost entirely turns, we must follow its particulars with more than usual attention.

Boniface VIII. Whatsoever flexibility or show of moderation Benedict Gaetano may have exhibited before his advancement, he threw off all disguise and all restraint as soon as he had attained the object of his ambition. His pride seemed to acknowledge no limit, and no considerations of religion, or policy, or decency could repress his violence. In 1298, Albert of Austria caused himself to be saluted king of the Romans; and having slain his competitor in battle, made the usual overture to the Pope for confirmation. But this favour Boniface was so far from according, that he placed the crown† upon his own head, and seizing a sword, exclaimed, 'It is I who am Cæsar, it is I who am Emperor; it is I who will defend the rights of the empire!' There is a solemn and affecting function in the Roman Church, (celebrated on the first day of Lent,) in which ashes are thrown on the heads of the proud and great, to remind them of their insignificance and mortality. While the Pope was performing this ceremony, one Spinola, Archbishop of Genoa, a political adversary, presented himself in his turn to receive the lesson of humiliation. Boniface beheld him, and dashing the ashes in his face, said to him, 'Ghibeline! remember that thou art dust, and that with thy brother Ghibelines, thou wilt return to dust‡.' As the kingdoms of Europe were then situated, not only in political reference to papal usurpation and predominance, but also in respect to the revival of learning, the progress of civilization, the change of principles, and the decay even of some inveterate prejudices, there only wanted an intemperate defender, such as

life, by respect for my conscience, by the feebleness of my body, by my deficiency in knowledge, by the evil disposition of the people; and to the end that I may be restored to the repose and consolation of my past life—resign the papacy freely and voluntarily, and renounce that office and that dignity, &c. . . .’ Such was the form of his resignation, as given by Fleury (l. 89, s. 34) on the authority of Wadingus, 1294, n. 6. As his power to resign was by some held doubtful, the Cardinals suggested to him first to publish a general Constitution, authorizing a Pope to abdicate his office. He did so.

* Soon after his resignation, he escaped from some attendants whom Boniface had placed over him, with the view of returning to his ancient cell; but finding himself pursued, he turned towards the eastern coast, in the hope of finding a refuge in Greece. He was speedily overtaken; but in the mean time he had materially swelled the catalogue of his miracles, and established that sort of reputation by which he merited his canonization.

† We may here observe that, in consistency with his principles, Boniface VIII. introduced the use of the *double crown*. It appears from the images of the Popes, as well as from historical evidence, that from St. Sylvester to Boniface VIII., they were contented with a single crown. From Boniface to Urban V., they doubled the symbol of royalty, as its substance was really falling from under them. From Urban downwards, throughout the decline and overthrow of their authority, they have fondly clung to the majesty of the triple crown.

‡ These anecdotes are related by Sismondi (Rep. Ital. chap. xxiv.) without suspicion, on the authority of Pipini and Muratori.

Boniface, to decide the wavering balance, and precipitate before its time the baseless despotism of Rome.

Those historians are, notwithstanding, in error, who date the decline of the papal supremacy from the reign of Innocent III. On the contrary, the system had not then quite attained the fulness of its force; it had not then achieved its greatest triumph, which, without question, was the deposition of Frederic II. And if it is true, that, from Innocent IV. to Boniface VIII., no additional ground was gained, that no fresh claims were asserted, even that some former claims were less effectually enforced; it is certain, on the other hand, that not one iota of the papal pretensions had been resigned; and that they had met for the most part with ready, or at least undisputed, acquiescence. But in the meantime, the understanding of mankind had been no longer stationary; knowledge and genius and reason had revived and taken courage, and were advancing to the assertion of their eternal rights; and in the eye of the philosopher, it was a circumstance of evil omen to the projects of Boniface, that they were urged by the contemporary of Dante. Nevertheless, whether insensible to the weakness of his own cause, or to the progress of the principles opposed to it, or imagining by violence to supply the want of strength, he resolved to push the temporal pretensions of the See to their most extravagant limits*.

His first measures wore, indeed, a specious appearance, since he presented himself as the advocate of peace. He endeavoured to reconcile Charles of Sicily and James of Arragon; and more than once obtruded his mediation upon the Kings of England and France: these attempts seem to have had no other fruit, than a considerable contribution levied upon the English clergy. He then turned his attention in other directions. In 1297, he gave the kingdom of Sardinia and Corsica in fief to James of Arragon and his posterity, on certain conditions of aid and subsidy to Rome. In 1300 he laid claim to the kingdom of Scotland, and directed Edward I. to withdraw his soldiers from that country; and in the correspondence thus occasioned between those two great usurpers, each party might have found it easier to invalidate the claims of the other, than to establish his own—this burst of empty arrogance passed of course without effect. He pretended to the disposal of the crown of Hungary, and gave it to a grandson of Charles le Boiteux; and when some of the nobles (in 1302) ventured to support a rival prince, he addressed his legate there established in the following terms:—‘The Roman pontiff established by God over kings and their kingdoms, sovereign chief of the hierarchy in the church militant, and holding the first rank above all mortals, sitteth in tranquillity in the throne of judgment and scattereth away all evil with his eyes† You have yet to learn that St. Stephen, the first Christian King of Hungary, offered and gave that kingdom

His temporal pretensions.

* Ruggiero di Loria having conquered Gerba, and some other islands, till then nearly unknown, near the coast of Africa, was contented to receive them in fief and on condition of tribute, from Boniface, who vouchsafed him a Bull of Investiture, in 1295. (Insulas objacentes Africæ, Gerbam nimirum et Cherchinas, quas Loria barbaris eripuerat, jure fiduciario, sedis Apostolicæ liberalitate Bonifacius ei possidendas attribuit. Raynaldus. Ann. 1295, s. xxxvi.) It was on the ground of this precedent, that two centuries afterwards, Alexander VI. assumed the right to dispose of all undiscovered tracts, continental or insular; and to concede the whole extent of terra incognita to Ferdinand and Isabella, by drawing a line on the map from pole to pole. Giannone, lib. xix. cap. 5.

† Prov. xx. 8.

to the Roman Church, not willing to assume the crown on his own authority, but rather to receive it from the vicar of Jesus Christ; since he knew, that no man taketh this honour on himself, but he that is called of God *.' In 1303 Boniface found it expedient to acknowledge as king of the Romans the same Albert whom he had formerly reviled: this concession was attended by a recognition of his own authority, by that prince, to the following effect. 'I acknowledge that the Roman empire has been transferred by the holy See, from the Greeks to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne; that the right to elect a king of the Romans, destined to be emperor, has been accorded by the holy see to certain princes ecclesiastical and secular; and that the kings and emperors receive from the holy see the power of the sword.' He concluded that act of subservience by an unconditional promise of military aid, if it should be required by the Pope. His sincerity was never put to trial, and when we consider for how long a period, and with what general success, the dependence of the empire had been asserted by the Popes, and recollect the peculiar foundation on which that claim rested, we shall scarcely wonder at its unequivocal acknowledgment by Albert. From these facts, we may at least observe the assiduity, with which Boniface pressed his temporal pretensions in every quarter of Europe. We shall now proceed to the principal theatre of his exertions, and watch the accumulation of the tempest which followed them.

The throne of France was then occupied by Philip the Fair—a man as arrogant, as jealous, as violent as Boniface, and perhaps even surpassing him in audacity. The clergy of France, though very faithfully attached to the Catholic Church and respecting the Pope as its head, had on various occasions, from the earliest period of papal usurpation, displayed an independent spirit of which we find no trace in other countries—yet not such as to give the slightest indications of schism, or even to prevent the holy see from making some successful inroads. The first † mention that we find of the liberties of the Gallican (as distinguished from the Roman) Church, is in the year 1229, and on an occasion of which it has no reason to be proud. A very rigorous Ordonnance was then published in the king's name for the extinction of Heresy—enjoining the immediate punishment of offenders, commanding the strictest search to be made for them, and offering a reward on conviction—and the end of this was—'to establish the liberties and immunities of the Gallican Church.'—But the act from which those liberties really date their origin, is the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis, published in 1269, on his departure against the Saracens. Its constitutions will be recorded in the next chapter. Their leading object was to protect episcopal election and preferment to benefices, the privileges granted to monasteries and ecclesiastical persons, and the property of the church generally, from the intrusions and exactions of Rome. Thus this matter rested till the reign of Boniface VIII. The fixed and distinct principle on which the Gallican liberties were finally placed (the inferiority of the Pope to a General Council), was not yet established, not perhaps even broached; but enough had been done to prove to a moderate Pope, that neither the king nor the clergy of France were prepared to acknowledge an implicit obedience.

The first difference between Boniface and Philip was merely sufficient to discover the disposition, and inflame the animosity of both. The

* Heb. v. 4.

† Fleury, liv. lxxix, sect. 1.

Pope had learnt, that the kings both of France and England had levied contributions on their clerical, as well as their lay, subjects for purposes of state. In consequence, he published, *Bull Clericis* in 1296, his celebrated Bull, beginning *Clericis Laicos*, of *Laicos*. which the substance was this: 'Antiquity relates to us the inveterate hostility* of the laity to the clergy, and the experience of the present age confirms it manifestly—since, without consideration that they have no power over ecclesiastical persons or property, they load with impositions both prelates and clergy, regular and secular; and also, to our deep affliction, prelates and other ecclesiastics are found, who, from their greater dread of temporal than eternal majesty, acquiesce in this abuse.' He then proceeds to pronounce sentence of excommunication against all who shall hereafter exact such impositions, whether kings, princes, or magistrates, and against all who shall pay them.

Very soon afterwards, Philip published, in retort, an edict, forbidding the export of money, jewels, and other articles specified, out of his dominions. The Pope, who was thereby deprived of his ecclesiastical contributions, presently put forth a long reply and remonstrance, in which he explained his preceding Bull to mean, that the consent of the Pope is necessary for the levying of the aforesaid contributions; that, in circumstances of great national exigency, even that might be dispensed with; and that the prohibition did not extend to donations strictly voluntary†. At the same time he enlarged on the liberty of the Church—the ark of Noah—the spouse of Jesus Christ—to which He had given power over all the body of the faithful, and over every individual member of it. By these general expressions he intended to insinuate, not only that princes had no power over the Church, but that the Church possessed unlimited control over princes. The rejoinder on the part of the king had more reason in its theology, and more piety in its reason. It professed a holy fear of God, and respectful reverence for the ministers of the Church; but, in the full consciousness of justice, it repelled with disdain the senseless menaces of man. In the following year, the Pope had the prudence to address to the archbishop of Rheims such an interpretation of the Bull as left to Philip no reasonable ground of complaint; and French historians, with great probability, attribute the rare moderation of Boniface to his necessities or his avarice‡.

The truce thus tacitly established between the parties was of very short duration. Indeed, where were so many undefined and disputable rights, it was not possible that peace could long subsist between two rivals equally disposed to encroachment and usurpation. In the year 1301, Philip arrested (and seemingly with justice) Bernard de Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, a creature of the Pope, on the charge of sedition and treasonable language, and caused him to be confined until the sentence of degradation should be passed on him, previous to the infliction of legal punishment. At the same time he wrote a respectful letter to Boniface, praying him to

* On this sentence, Fleury, the most candid of Catholics, very simply remarks, 'That aversion of laymen for the clergy, which the Pope mentions, ascended not to a very high antiquity; since for the five or six first ages, the clergy secured the respect and affections of all men, by their charitable and disinterested conduct.' (liv. lxxxix. s. xliii.) No clergy, which shapes its conduct by any other principle, ever will secure, or ever ought to secure, either affection or respect.

† Pagi, Vit. Bonif. VIII., sect. xxviii.

‡ To the same cause we may probably ascribe the proclamation of the first Jubilee, in the year 1300, by Boniface,—an institution to which we shall recur in a future chapter.

deprive the culprit of his clerical privileges, or at least to take measures for his conviction. But Boniface, having learnt that a bishop had been placed in confinement, addressed his answer (which he sent by a special legate) to that point only; and denying that laymen had received any power over the clergy, he enjoined the king to dismiss the prisoner freely to the pontifical presence, with full restitution of all his property, at the same time reminding him that he had himself incurred canonical punishment for having rashly laid his hand on the person of a bishop. On the same day, or very soon afterwards, he published a Bull, addressed also to Philip, in which, after exhorting his son to listen * with docility to his instructions, he proceeded in the following terms:—'God has set me over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant †, in his name, and by his doctrine. Let no one persuade you, then, that you have no superior, or that you are not subject to the chief of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He that holds that opinion is senseless, and he that obstinately maintains it is an infidel, separate from the flock of the good Shepherd.' . . . He then continued, still out of his affection ‡ for Philip, to charge him with many general violations of the ecclesiastical privileges, or, as they were then more commonly called, Liberties; and concluded by informing him, that he had summoned all the superior clergy of France to an assembly at Rome, on the 1st of the November following (1302), in order to deliberate on the remedies for such abuses.

Philip was astonished by this measure, but not so confounded as to deviate either into timidity or rashness. He convoked a full and early assembly or parliament of his nobles and clergy. In the meantime, he burnt the Bull of the Pope as publicly as possible, and caused that act to be proclaimed with trumpets throughout the whole of Paris. In his subsequent address to his parliament, he mentioned the proceedings of Boniface, disclaimed with scorn any temporal allegiance to him, retorted the charges of corruption and mal-administration, declared his readiness to risk any loss or suffering in defence of the common interests, and referred the decision of the question to the assembly. The barons and lay members pronounced their opinions loudly and unhesitatingly in favour of the king. With them the question was, in a great degree, national. They were jealous of the honour of the crown, and eager to protect it from any foreign insult. And though a calmer judgment would, perhaps, have taught them, that such a restraint upon the monarchy might, in its effects, be beneficial to all classes of the people, they sacrificed every consideration of policy to the passion of the moment. The situation of the clergy was exceedingly difficult, since they had two duties to reconcile, which, even in ordinary times, were not always in strict ac-

* *Ausculta, fili*—the two first words of this Bull—have affixed to it its historical name. It was published in December, 1301, and was preceded only two days by another constitution of Boniface, called *Salvator Mundi*, by which he suspended all favours and privileges which had been accorded by his predecessors to the kings of France, and to all their subjects, whether lay or clerical, who abetted Philip. Pagi, Bonif. VIII., sec. lvi.

† Jerem. i. 10. The words are addressed to Jeremiah, in respect to his prophetic mission; but they had been perverted to the support of the papal pretensions long before the time of Boniface. See, for instance, the letter of Honorius III., written in 1225, to Louis of France. The 'plentitude of power which the Holy See has received from God' is there placed chiefly on that foundation.

‡ Another reason, by which he justified his interference, was his own responsibility to God for the soul of King Philip.

cordance, and which were then in direct opposition. Their first attempt was to explain and justify the *intentions* of the Pope; but that was repelled with general contempt and indignation. Then they expressed a dutiful anxiety to assist the king, and maintain the liberties of the kingdom; but at the same time they pleaded the obedience due from them to the Pope, and prayed for permission to attend his summons to Rome. This permission was clamorously refused by the king and his barons.

The clergy then addressed a letter to the Pope, in which they expressed an apprehension lest the violent and universal hostility *, not of the king and his barons only, but of the body of the laity, should lead to an entire rupture between France and Rome, and even between the clergy and the people; and they prayed that he would release them from the summons to Rome. At the same time the barons also wrote—not, indeed, to the Pope, but to the College of Cardinals—in severe censure of the new and senseless pretensions of Boniface, on whom personally they cast the entire blame of the difference. In reply, the cardinals disavowed, on the part of Boniface, any assertion that the king of France held his temporalities of the Pope; while, in defence of his ghostly authority, they maintained, ‘that no man in his senses can doubt, that the Pope, as chief of the spiritual hierarchy, can dispense with the sin of every man living.’ In his reply to the dutiful supplication of the prelates, the Pope rebuked them for their want of courage and attachment, enforced on them the indisputable subjection of things temporal to things spiritual, and persisted in commanding their attendance at Rome.

The great majority disregarded the summons; but some few were found who considered their first obedience as due to their ecclesiastical sovereign. These proceeded *Bull Unam Sanctam*, to Rome; and, in spite of their small number, Boniface availed himself of the name of this Council to publish the Decretal, commonly known as the *Bull Unam Sanctam*. The propositions asserted in this celebrated constitution are, first, the Unity of the Holy Catholic Church, without which there is no salvation; wherein is one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Hence it follows, that of this one and only Church there is one body and one head, (not two heads, which would be monstrous,) namely, Christ, and Christ’s vicar, St. Peter, and the successor of St. Peter. The second position is, that in the power of this Chief are two swords, the one spiritual, and the other material; but that the former of these is to be used by the Church, the latter for the Church; the former is in the hand of the priest, the latter in the hand of kings and soldiers, but at the nod and sufferance of the priest. It is next asserted, that one of these swords must be subject to the other sword, otherwise we must suppose two opposite principles, which would be Manichæan and heretical. Thence it is an easy inference, that the spiritual is that which has rule over the other, while itself is liable to no other judgment or authority than that of God. The general conclusion is contained in one short sentence,—‘Wherefore we declare, define, and pronounce, that it is absolutely essential to the salvation of every human being, that he be subject unto the Roman pontiff†.’

* ‘The laity absolutely fly from our society, and repel us from their conferences and councils, as if we were guilty of treason against them. They despise ecclesiastic censures, from whatsoever quarter they may come, and are preparing and taking precautions to render them useless.’ Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.*, liv. xc., sec. ix.

† The texts on which these propositions were chiefly founded are John x. 16; Romans xiii. 1; Jeremiah i. 10; 1 Corinthians ii. 15.

But Boniface did not content himself with mere assertions. On the very same day he also published a Bull of excommunication against all persons, of whatsoever rank, even kings or emperors, who should interfere in any way to prevent or impede those, who might desire to present themselves before the Roman See. This edict was, of course, understood to be directly levelled against Philip. Soon afterwards he sent a legate into France, the bearer of twelve articles, which boldly expressed such papal pretensions, as were in opposition to those of the king; and concluded with a menace of temporal as well as spiritual proceedings. The claims contained in these articles have been already mentioned, and do not require enumeration. But what may raise our surprise is, that the answer of Philip was extremely moderate; that he condescended to explain away much that seemed objectionable in his conduct; that he promised to remedy any abuses which his officers might have committed, and expressed his strong desire for concord with the Roman Church.

His moderation may have been affected, and his explanations frivolous, and the abuses in question he may not have seriously intended to alleviate. But at least it is true that he had never sought the enmity of Rome; and had Boniface availed himself of that occasion to close the breach, when he might have closed it with profit and dignity, his last days might have been passed in lofty tranquillity; he would have been respected and feared, even by those who hated him; and posterity would still have admired the courage and the policy which had contended against the most powerful prince in Europe, in no very blind or superstitious age, without disadvantage or dishonour. But the Pope did not perceive this crisis in his destiny. He proceeded in his former course—he proclaimed his dissatisfaction at the answers of the king, and repeated and redoubled his menaces.

Philip had then recourse to that public measure which so deeply influenced the future history of papacy—the convocation of a General Council, to pronounce on the proceedings of the Pope. But while he was engaged in preparations for this great contest, and for the establishment of a principle to which his clergy were not yet prepared to listen*, a latent and much shorter path was opened to the termination of his perplexities.

William of Nogaret, a celebrated French civilian, in conjunction with certain Romans of the Colonna family, who had fled for refuge to Paris from the oppression of Boniface, passed secretly into Italy, and tampered successfully with the personal attendants of the Pope. The usual residence of the latter was Anagni, a city some forty or fifty miles to the south-east of Rome, and his birth-place. There, in the year 1303, he had composed another Bull, in which he maintained, ‘that, as vicar of Jesus Christ, he had the power to govern kings with a rod of iron, and to dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel †;’ and he had destined the 8th of September, the anniversary of the nativity of the Virgin, for its promulgation. A rude interruption disturbed his dreams of omnipotence, and discovered the secret of his real weakness. On the very day preceding the intended publication of the Bull, Nogaret, with Sciarra Colonna, and some other nobles, escorted by about three hundred horsemen, and a larger number of partizans on foot, bearing the banners of France, rushed into Anagni, with shouts of

* Not only did the bishops and the whole clergy decline any active part in the proceedings against the Pope, but they refused any share in them, and only consented to the convocation of the council through the necessity of seeking some remedy for the disorders of the Church.

† Psalms ii. 9.

'Success to the king of France!—Death to Pope Boniface!' After a feeble resistance, they became masters of the pontifical palace. The cardinals dispersed and fled—through treachery, as some assert; or, more probably, through mere timidity. The greater part of the Pope's personal attendants fled also.

Boniface, when he perceived that he was surprised and abandoned, prepared himself with uncommon resolution for the last outrage. 'Since I am betrayed (he cried) as Jesus Christ was betrayed, I will at least die like a Pope.' He then clothed himself in his official vestments, and placed the crown of Constantine on his head, and grasped the keys and the cross in his hands, and seated himself in the pontifical chair. He was now eighty-six years of age. And when Sciarra Colonna, who first penetrated into his presence, beheld the venerable form and dignified composure of his enemy, his purpose, which doubtless was sanguinary, seemed suddenly to have deserted him, and his revenge did not proceed beyond verbal insult*. Nogaret followed. He approached the Pope with some respect, but at the same time imperiously informed him, that he must prepare to be present at the council forthwith to be assembled on the subject of his misconduct, and to submit to its decision. The Pope addressed him—'William of Nogaret, descended from a race of heretics, it is from thee, and such as thee, that I can patiently endure indignity.' The ancestors of Nogaret had atoned for their errors in the flames. But the expression of the pontiff was not prompted by any offence he felt at that barbarity; not by any consciousness of the iniquity of his own oppression †, or any sense of the justice of the retribution; it proceeded simply from the sectarian hatred which swelled his own breast, which he felt to be implacable, and which he believed to be mutual.

While their leaders were thus employed, the body of the conspirators dispersed themselves throughout the splendid apartments in eager pursuit of plunder. Any deliberate plan which might have been formed against the person of the Pope, was disappointed by their avarice. During the day of the attack, and that which followed, the French appear to have been wholly occupied in the ransack. But in the meantime the people of Anagni were recovered from their panic; and perhaps they were more easily awakened to the shame of deserting their Pope and their citizen, when they discovered the weakness of the aggressors, and the snare into which their license had led them. They took up arms, assaulted the French, and having expelled or massacred them, restored to the pontiff his freedom and authority.

But they were unable to restore his insulted honour and the spirit which had been broken by indignity. Infuriated by the disgrace of his captivity, he hurried from Anagni to Rome, burning *His Death.* for revenge. But the violence of his passion presently over-

* Some modern French historians assert that Boniface was severely wounded by the assailants—a story which is idly repeated by Mosheim, and re-echoed even by Gibbon. It is the *unanimous* affirmation of contemporary writers, that no hand was raised against him. See Sismondi, chap. xxiv. The words of S. Antoninus (part 3, tit. xx., cap. 8. sec. xxi.) are express. 'Domino autem disponente, ob dignitatem Apostolicæ Sedis, nemo, ex inimicis ejus ausus fuit mittere in eum manus; sed indutum sacris vestibus dimiserunt sub honesta custodia, et ipsi insistebant prædæ, &c.' See Pagi, Bonif. VIII., sec. lxx.

† Boniface VIII. was a very faithful patron of the Inquisition; and if his name is not distinguished in the list of persecuting popes, it is rather from the want of opportunity, than of inclination. Persecution being now systematized by the regular machinery of the Inquisition, there were fewer occasions for individual distinction. See Whately on 'The Errors of Romanism,' ch. v., sec. iii., vi., p. 241—244.

powered his reason, and his death immediately followed. He was attended by an antient servant, who exhorted him to confide himself in his calamity to the Consoler of the afflicted. But Boniface made no reply. His eyes were haggard, his mouth white with foam, and he gnashed his teeth in silence. He passed the day without nourishment, the night without repose; and when he found that his strength began to fail, and that his end was not far distant, he removed all his attendants, that there might be no witness to his final feebleness and his parting struggle. After some interval, his domestics burst into the room, and beheld his body stretched on the bed, stiff and cold. The staff which he carried bore the mark of his teeth, and was covered with foam; his white locks were stained with blood; and his head was so closely wrapped in the counterpane, that he was believed to have anticipated his impending death by violence and suffocation*.

This took place on the 10th of October; and precisely on the same day, after an interval of three hundred and three years, his body was dug up, and transferred to another place of sepulture. Spondanus†, the Catholic historian, was at Rome at the moment. He relates the circumstances, and mentions the eagerness with which the whole city rushed to the spectacle. His body was found, covered with the pontifical vestments, still fresh and uncorrupted. His hands, which his enemies had asserted to have been bitten away in his rage, were so free from decay and mutilation, with every finger entire, that even the veins and nerves appeared to be swelling with flesh and life.

After the death of Boniface the French interest presently prevailed in the College; and in the year 1305 the archbishop of Bourdeaux, a native of France, was elected to the chair. He took the title of Clement V., and presently transferred the papal residence from Rome to Avignon.

CHAPTER XXI.

(I.) *On Lewis IX. of France*—His public motives—contrasted with those of Constantine and Charlemagne—His virtues, piety, and charity—Particulars of his civil legislation—His superstition—The original Crown of Thorns—its removal to Paris—its reception by the king. His death—His miracles and canonization—The Bull of Boniface VIII.—(II.) *On the Inquisition*.—Whether St. Lewis contributed to its establishment—Origin of the Inquisition—Office of St. Dominic and his contemporaries—Erection of a separate tribunal at Toulouse—by Gregory IX.—The authority then vested in the Mendicants—Its unpopularity in France—Co-operation of St. Lewis—Conduct of Frederic II.—Of Innocent IV.—Limits to the prevalence of the Inquisition.—(III.) *On the Gallican Liberties*.—Remonstrance of the Prelates of France respecting excommunications. Firmness of Lewis—His visit to the Cistercian chapter. The supplication of the monks, and the reply of the King—Early spirit and sense of independence in the French clergy—The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Lewis—Its principle—The six articles which constitute it—Consequences of the policy of Innocent III.—(IV.) *On the Crusades*. Remarks on the character and circumstances of the first Crusade—Exertions of St. Bernard for the second Crusade—its fatal result—Excuse of that abbot—Causes of the fall of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem—Third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh

* Sismondi, Rep. Ital., end of chap. xxiv. ‘Concerning which Boniface (says Matthew of Westminster) a certain versifier wrote as follows:—

Ingreditur Vulpes, regnat Leo, sed Canis exit;
Re tandem vera si sic fuit, ecce Chimæra!—

Flores Histor. ad ann. 1303.

Others give the same in the form of a prophecy, delivered by Morone during his imprisonment. Ascendisti ut Vulpes, regnabis ut Leo, et morieris ut Canis. Antiq. Eccles. Britann. ad ann. 1295.

† Spondanus continued the History of Baronius from the year 1197, in which it concludes, to 1646. See also Bzovius on this same occurrence.—Ann. 1303.

Crusades—The eighth and ninth. **St. Lewis**—Termination of the Crusades, and final loss of Palestine—General remarks—(1.) On the *Origin* and first motives of religious pilgrimage—Treatment of first pilgrims by the Saracens—Pilgrimage during the 10th and 11th centuries—Conquest of Palestine by the Turks—Practice of private feuds and warfare in Europe—prevalent in the 10th century—The superstitious spirit of the same age—associated with the military—General predilection in favour of a Crusade—Failure of Sylvester II. and Gregory VII.—(2.) On the *Objects* of the Crusades—what they were—what they were not—The object of the first distinguished from that of following Crusades—Conduct and policy of the sovereigns of Europe—Of the Vatican—Gradual change in its objects.—(3.) On the *Results* of the Crusades—Advantages produced by them—Few and partial—on government—on commerce—on general civilization—Evils occasioned—Religious wars—Immoral influence—Corruption of church discipline—Canonical penance—Introduction of the Plenary Indulgence—its abuses—The Jubilee—Interests of the clergy. *Note (A).* On the collections of papal decretals—That of Gratian—the Liber Sextus—Clementines, &c.—*Note (B).* On the University of Paris—The Four Faculties—Foundation of the Sorbonne.—*Note (C).* On certain Theological Writers—Rise and progress of the Scholastic System of Theology—Peter the Lombard—His 'Book of the Sentences'—St. Thomas Aquinas—His history and productions—St. Bonaventure—the character of his theology—The Realists and Nominalists—or Thomists and Scotists.—The Immaculate Conception.

It is seldom that the stream of ecclesiastical history receives any important contribution from the biography of kings. Our more peaceful course is indeed perpetually troubled by the eddies of secular polity, and most so in the most superstitious ages. The names of Constantine and Charlemagne have, it is also true, deserved an eminent rank among the heroes of the church. But if we pass over the legendary tales of the monarch-monks of the darkest days, we shall scarcely discover any other powerful prince whose policy was formed either on an ardent sense of religion, or an attachment to ecclesiastical interests, until we arrive at the reign of Lewis IX. And here we must at once distinguish the principles of that prince from those either of Constantine or of Charlemagne. By whatsoever motives of genuine piety those two sovereigns may really have been influenced, it is certain that their ecclesiastical institutions were chiefly regulated for political ends. It was their object—an object worthy of their royal rank and virtues—to improve the moral and religious condition of their subjects through the instrumentality of Christ's ministers; and at the same time to raise the dignity and character of those, whose sacred office, when they are not the worst of men, is calculated to make them the best. But the actions of Lewis were not guided by any such considerations. They proceeded from that which it was the purpose of the others' policy to create—an absorbing Christian piety, with its train of concomitant excellencies. On this subject there is no difference among historians, except in as far as some are more disposed to ridicule the superstitious excesses into which he fell, through the practice of his age, than to do justice to the lofty motives whence his virtues proceeded.

SECTION I.

On Lewis IX.

Lewis IX. was born about the year 1215, and came to the throne at a very early age. He was educated by a mother named Blanche, who was eminent for her devotion to God and the church; and we should here remark, that he drew his first breath, and received his earliest notions of ecclesiastical polity, among the groans of the suffering Albigeois. The sanctity of his private life was not sullied by any stain, nor was it clouded by any austerity. 'Never, since I was born,' (says Joinville,) 'did I hear him speak ill of any one.' He loved his subjects; and had his lot been cast in happier days, he would have loved mankind. But the principles of his church so contracted those of his religion, that his benevolence could never expand itself into philanthropy.

He was devout in private prayer, as well as a constant attendant on the offices of the church. On the one hand, his submission to the admonitions, and even to the personal corrections, of his confessor is diligently recorded; and on the other, his adoration of the Holy Cross * is recounted with no less admiration. He would descend from his seat, and advancing in a homely garment, with his head, neck, and feet bare, and his children behind him, bend with such profound humility before the emblems of his salvation, that the spectators were moved to tears of affection and piety. He appears, too, from the same accounts, to have washed the feet of monks and of mendicants, by a very common exercise of self-abasement. And we may overlook this foolish affectation in that substantial excellence, which distributed his charitable benefactions without thrift or partiality, through every class of those who needed them. The foundation of many churches and monasteries secured at the same time the gratitude and fidelity of his spiritual subjects,

Hume has ascribed to Lewis IX., together with 'the mean and abject superstition of a monk, the magnanimity of a hero, the integrity of a patriot, the humanity of a philosopher'—That insatiable zeal for crusades, which neither his reason, which was powerful, nor his humanity, nor his philosophy, nor all united, were even in later life sufficient to allay, afforded at the same time the most pernicious proofs of his superstition and his heroism. But his patriotism was more honourably displayed in the internal regulation of his kingdom; in the removal of abuses, in the advancement of civilization; and in this office, (as his domestic biographer observes,) he so combined the secular with the spiritual interests of his subjects, that he seemed to discharge by the same acts the double office of priest and king †. He detested the practice of usury; and to that motive we may perhaps attribute his hatred for the Jews, who exercised the trade exclusively. Still we must doubt the wisdom, while we censure the cruelty, of the edict, by which he expelled them from the country. He enacted a very severe (according to our notions, a barbarous ‡) law against blasphemy. While we praise his bold, though seemingly ineffectual, attempts to restrain the moral profligacy of his nobles, we shall scarcely less applaud the vigour, with which he exerted against that body the power of royalty, in a cause almost equally sacred. It was a leading object of his policy, to protect the lower classes of his subjects against the brutal § oppression of the aristocracy; and to unite the interests of the crown and the people against that privileged order, which was equally hostile to the independence of both. Justice he commonly admi-

* See the book 'De Vita et Actibus Ludovici,' &c. by his chaplain, William (Carnotensis) of Chartres; and his 'Vita, Conversatio et Miracula,' by F. Gaufridus his confessor. One object of the latter is to point out the exact correspondence of the character of Lewis with that of Josiah. The particular description and changes of his coarse raiment; the days of his fasting, of his abstinence from meat, or from fruit and fish, or from every kind of fish except one, or from every thing except bread and water, and such like details of his devotional observances, are related by both writers; especially by the confessor, and in his 17th chapter. The king's eleemosynary liberality forms the worthier subject of that which follows. Both his biographers were Dominicans.

† 'Quod etiam quodammodo regale sacerdotium, aut sacerdotale regimen videretur pariter exercere.'—Gulielm. Carnotensis.

‡ He caused the lips (or, as some say, the forehead) of those convicted, to be seared with a hot iron.

§ Having learnt, on one occasion, that a nobleman had hanged three children for the offence of hunting rabbits, Lewis condemned him to capital punishment. But the rest of the nobility united with so much determination to preserve the life of their fellow-tyrant and the prerogatives of their order, that the king was obliged to commute the punishment for deprivation of property.

nistered in person*, and tempered it with his natural clemency. At the same time he endeavoured to purify its sources by permanent alterations, and to secure at least for future ages the blessings, which he might despair effectually to impart to his own. Accordingly, he struck at the root of the evil, and made it the grand object of his efforts, to substitute trial by evidence for the 'judgments of God;' and most especially for the most sanguinary among them, the decision by duel. His ordinances on those subjects were obeyed within the boundaries of his own domains: but he had not the power to enforce them universally. The Barons, who were severally the legislators in their own estates, adhered to the venerable establishments of former days; and a more general diffusion of knowledge was required, before the plainest reason, aided even by royal authority, could prevail against the inveterate sanctity of instituted absurdities.

It was the same with those humane endeavours to arrest the practice of private warfare, in which he anticipated the course of civilization by more than two centuries†. But when he despaired of effecting this object at once, he attempted at least to mitigate the mischief by a judicious prohibition—that neither party should commence hostilities till forty days after the offence had been offered‡. Thus was he compelled to temporize with a great national evil, of which he felt at the same time the whole extent, as well as his own incapacity to correct it. From these instances we may observe, that the civil legislation of St. Louis was generally founded on wise policy, and that it always sprang from benevolent motives. We shall presently notice some of his ecclesiastical enactments; but, at the same time, it must be admitted, that the charge of 'abject superstition' alleged against him by the philosophical historian is not less just, than the merits also ascribed to him; nor will it here be out of place to recount one celebrated incident in support of this imputation.

The History of the Church comprises the records of superstition, which in those corrupt ages was indeed so interwoven with piety, that it is rare to find them separate. The character of St. Lewis particularly exemplified their combination; it may be perpetually detected in his warlike enterprises; but there is not one among his spiritual adventures which better illustrates himself and his age than the following:—The original Crown of Thorns had been long preserved at Constantinople as the most precious and venerable among the relics of Christ; yet such were at this time the necessities of the government, that the holy treasure was consigned in pawn to the government of Venice. It was delivered over to

*Reception of the
Crown of Thorns.*

* 'I have often seen the saint,' (says Joinville,) 'after he had heard mass, in summer, come out to the Forest of Vincennes, and seat himself at the foot of an oak, and make us sit all round him. And those who had any business came and spoke to him without any officer giving them hinderance.—And sometimes he would come to the Garden of Paris, and have carpets spread for us to sit near him; and then he administered justice to his people, as he did at Vincennes.'—*Histoire du Roy St. Louis*, p. 23. Edit. Paris, 1617. This history, which is the life of an admirable king and Christian, by a candid, loyal, unaffected soldier, is a beautiful specimen of inartificial biography. But, unhappily, the most beneficial, and, therefore, the noblest acts of the monarch, are not those which have most attracted the attention of the soldier. The details of his campaigns, and many anecdotes of his private life, are related with minuteness and seeming accuracy; but his great legislative enactments are slightly, or not at all noticed.

† The right of private feud cannot be considered as abolished, until nearly the end of the 15th century. In collecting a large and, for those days, a valuable library, and in encouraging the progress of knowledge among his subjects, St. Louis opened the only certain path to their civilization.

‡ Some attribute this regulation to Philippe Auguste.

the commissioners of the Republic, who immediately set sail, in a wintry and inclement season, full of religious confidence, and were preserved (as it was thought) through a perilous voyage by the holiness of their charge. The pledge, which the Greeks were too poor or too wise to redeem, was eagerly purchased by St. Lewis, and the relic, after a few months at Venice of repose and adoration, continued its pilgrimage to the west. During the course of an overland journey it was again distinguished by the favour of the elements; and though the rain fell abundantly during the nights, not a drop descended by day to interrupt its progress. At length when it arrived at Troyes in Champagne, the event was notified to the king at Paris, and he instantly set off to welcome it, accompanied by the Queen Blanche his mother, by his brothers, by some prelates, and other nobles.

The royal company met their holy acquisition in the neighbourhood of Sens, and after they had uncovered the case and beheld the object, and moistened it with pious tears, they assembled the clergy of the diocese and formed a solemn procession towards the city. As they approached the gates, the king and his eldest brother, the Count d'Artois, received the venerated burden on their shoulders; and in this manner, with naked feet, and no other covering than a shirt *, they carried it, in the midst of the adoring crowd, into the cathedral. . . . Thence it proceeded to Paris, and there its arrival was hailed with a repetition of the same degrading solemnities. The whole clergy and the whole people were in motion, and again the two illustrious brothers, barefoot and naked as before, supported and deposited it in the destined sanctuary. An annual festival was instituted to commemorate an event of such national importance—the introduction of this new palladium. But its value was soon afterwards diminished by the importation of a formidable rival for the popular adoration. It was not long before the royal enthusiast succeeded in procuring some substantial fragments of the real Cross; and this acquisition again furnished him with another pretext to multiply to his lively subjects the occasions of religious festivity.

In the year 1270, St. Lewis died before Tunis, while in the prosecution of his second crusade. His last words were said to have been these†—‘Lord, I will enter into thine house; I will worship in thy holy temple, and give glory to thy name.

His Death, Into thy hands I commend my spirit.’ From the beginning of his life to its latest breath the same principle predominated, the same religious fervour (however it may sometimes have been perverted) influenced all his actions; and, perhaps, in the interminable catalogue of her Saints, the Church of Rome cannot number a name more worthy of that celestial dignity than Lewis IX. But the merit to which that pious monarch was chiefly indebted for his heavenly office, was not that to which he had ever particularly pretended. His eminent virtues, his religious life and death, even his services to the Catholic Church, might seem to have entitled him to that high reward. But those claims had been wholly insufficient, had it not also been conclusively attested that he had performed many manifest and astonishing miracles.

The canonization of Lewis IX. took place twenty-seven years after his death, and almost the whole of that time was employed in collecting

* Vita et Convers. S. Ludovici, &c., per F. Gaufridum. Aug. 11, 1239, was the day consecrated by this exploit.

† So says William of Chartres, and Boniface VIII. in his Bull of Canonization, confirms it.

the necessary documents *. The rapid succession of the Popes was the cause which retarded it; and it may seem as if in mockery of his holy character, that the performance *and Canonization* of this office did at last devolve upon Boniface VIII.

It was Boniface who preached the panegyric sermon, and enlarged on those various virtues which had no counterpart in his own bosom. It was the genius of arrogance which paid homage to the spirit of humility, and exalted it even to the thrones of heaven. 'Let the hosts of heaven rejoice at the arrival of so noble and glorious an inhabitant—an approved and eminent husbandman of the Christian faith is added to their multitudes. Let the glorious nobility of the celestial citizens sound the jubilee of joy, for an honoured stranger is adscribed to their ranks. Let the venerable assembly of the Saints arise with gladness and exultation to receive a compeer who well deserves such dignity. Arise, thou innumerable council of faith; zealots of the faith arise, and sing the hymn of praise in concert with the Church which is your own. . . He offered offence to no one, to no one violence or injury. He carefully observed the boundaries of justice, without deserting the path of equity. He punished with the sword the daring and lawless enterprises of the wicked. An ardent lover of peace and concord—an anxious promoter of unity—hostile to scandals and dissensions †, &c. &c. We may remark that this last topic, in the mouth of Boniface VIII., was at best an equivocal eulogy. A zeal for 'unity,' and an abhorrence of 'scandals and dissensions,' is a praise which, when proceeding from pontifical lips, conveys the necessary suspicion of intolerance. Louis has been accused of that crime—the ruling iniquity of his age—and we shall now examine on what facts that charge is really founded.

SECTION II.

On the Inquisition.

It is asserted, and with truth, that the Inquisition was permanently established in France during the reign of St. Louis; that he never ceased to manifest great partiality for the Dominicans and Franciscans ‡, and all invested with the inquisitorial office; and that it was even at the particular solicitation of the king §, that Alexander IV. confirmed, in 1255, the

* In the first of the two sermons delivered by Boniface on that occasion, he expressly asserts, that after the fullest examination into the evidence for the miracles, he has ascertained that sixty-three miracles were assuredly performed, besides others which God evidently vouchsafed to him—(sexaginta tria, inter cætera quæ Dominus evidenter ostendit, certitudinaliter facta cognovimus.) Respecting the tedious duration of the investigation Boniface remarks, in the same discourse, with great simplicity—'Et ita per tot et totiens examinatum est, rubricatum et discussum negotium, quod de hoc plus facta est descriptura, quam unus asinus posset portare.'

† It is difficult to conceive a more turgid and tautologous composition than this celebrated bull. The merits which Louis really possessed are enumerated without taste or feeling; and the author of the panegyric seems to have been wholly incapable of estimating the character which he pretended to eulogize.

‡ It appears that he intended to educate two of his sons in monasteries, and that by his Testament he consigned one to Dominican, the other to Franciscan tuition.—Gaufridus, *Vita et Conversat.* chap. 14.

§ See Limborch, *Hist. Inquisit.* lib. i. cap. 16. The annalist Raynaldus has expressed his pious regret, that the admirable institution of the Saint was feebly supported, and even entirely overthrown by his degenerate successors! We should observe that the domains of the Count of Poitiers and Toulouse, who was then Alphonso, brother of the king, were excepted from the jurisdiction of the prior, as being already subject to a special commis-

institution of that tribunal, and appointed the Prior of the Dominican Convent at Paris to be Inquisitor-general in France. That we may be able to estimate the real weight of these assertions, and (what is more important than the reputation of any individual) that we may understand on what ground that frightful structure was erected, we must trace as shortly as possible the causes which led to its foundation.

The itinerant emissaries of Innocent III., among whom Dominic is the name most celebrated, first obtained the title of Inquisitors—that is to say, they were invested by the Pope with authority to discover, to convert, or to arraign before the ecclesiastical courts all guilty or suspected of heresy. But this was the limit of their commission. They did not constitute an independent tribunal, nor were they clothed with any judicial power. The process was still carried on, according to the practice then prevailing, before the bishop of the diocese, and the secular arm was invited, when necessary, to enforce his sentence. But this form of proceeding was not found sufficiently rapid to satisfy the eagerness of the Pope and his missionaries. The work of extirpation was sometimes retarded by the compunctions of a merciful prelate, sometimes by the reluctance of the civil authorities to execute a barbarous or unpopular sentence *. And to remove these impediments to the course of destruction, there was no resource, except to institute in the infected provinces, with the direct co-operation of the ruling powers, a separate tribunal for causes of heresy. This object was not immediately accomplished. In the meantime the Dominicans and Franciscans were spreading their numbers and influence in every country. And as they were the faithful myrmidons of the Roman See, and more devoted in their allegiance than either the secular or the regular clergy, thus arose an additional reason for investing them with a distinct jurisdiction. By the council held at Toulouse in 1229, (of which the decrees have been noticed in a former chapter,) a canon was published which united ‘one priest with three laymen,’ in a sort of council of inquisition. It is this regulation which is reasonably considered as the foundation of the *Court of Inquisition* †.

To Pope Gregory IX. be ascribed the honour of this success! Still the court thus established continued to be a court of bishops. Its *object* was indeed exclusively such as the most zealous pontiff could have desired; but it was composed of materials neither wholly destitute of human feeling, nor blindly subservient to the papal will. A further change was, therefore, necessary; and, accordingly, about three years afterwards, Gregory found means to transfer the authority in the new court to the Dominican order. It was thus that the Inquisition, properly so called—that is, a court for the trial of heretics, erected by papal authority, and administered

sion on matters of faith.—Fleury, liv. lxxxiv. § lxxxv. The act of St. Louis was to establish that generally throughout his kingdom, which had hitherto been confined to the most infected province.

* It should be remarked on the other hand, that it was sometimes (especially in the beginning of the persecutions) precipitated by the agency of popular fury, excited by the preachers *against* the heretics. Their favourite text is said to have been (Psalm xciv. v. 16.) ‘Who will rise up for me against the evil-doers? Who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?’ Many of them were eloquent—the people were superstitious—the preachers were fanatics. In fact, when the ecclesiastical censures were despised, and the secular power refused its aid, popular madness was their only remaining instrument.

† By the Council of Narbonne, held two years before, it was enacted, ‘that the bishops should establish in each parish synodal witnesses to inquire into heresy, and other notorious crimes, and to make their report.’ These were truly established inquisitors;—still their office was to report, not to judge.

by papal dependents—was indeed instituted. . . . Some popular commotions * followed its first proceedings ;—the persons of the judges were exposed to insult, and the whole body was, for a short time, expelled from the city. But the spirit of Rome was yet too powerful,—the fugitives were presently restored. And though the inquisitorial system never reached in France those refinements in barbarity which some other countries have endured—though it obtained, in truth, no very permanent footing among a humane and generous people—it continued to subsist there for several years ; and if there was any sceptre under which it can be said to have flourished, it was assuredly the sceptre of St. Louis. Still we must not forget that it was established in his boyhood ; so that the guilt of *that* † act is unjustly cast upon him. He perpetuated the evil which he found ; and in the religious code of those days, the ‘unity of the Church’ was so carefully identified with the glory of Christ, that an ardent desire for the one might easily degenerate into a misguided zeal for the other : and thus, without intending to exculpate the royal persecutor, we are bound to distinguish between the crime of those who created that ecclesiastical system, and of him who blindly supported it ;—of the churchmen ‡ who artfully confounded the essence of religion with the maintenance of their own power, and of the pious laymen, who adopted with reverence the undisputed and consecrated maxims.

The brutal edicts § of Frederic II., published about 1144, and not exceeded by the most barbarous emanations of the Vatican, were not palliated by any motive of misdirected piety : *Progress of the Inquisition.* yet were they much more effectual than the encouragement of Louis in arming the fury of the Dominicans, at least within the limits of his empire. But the intolerant zeal of Frederic neither softened the hostility of Innocent IV., nor preserved himself from the anathemas of the Church ¶. After his triumph, Innocent pursued and exceeded the footsteps of his predecessors. He established the Tribunal ¶ of the Inquisition in the north of Italy, and in that form which

* Besides the indignation excited by the object of this institution, there was a general objection among laymen to the establishment of *any* new ecclesiastical tribunal, to which all classes were alike amenable. And this was not diminished when, to the original offences of heresy, those of Judaism, Mahometanism, sodomy, sacrilege, and even polygamy, were added. But we have not observed that this wide extension of the objects of that court was ever made in France.

† We must notice the injustice which has hastily been offered to the character of Louis IX. by Mosheim. That writer having asserted (on the authority of the Benedictine compilers of the history of Languedoc) that Louis published a barbarous edict against heretics, in the year 1229, proceeds thus :—‘A great part of the sanctity of good King Louis consisted in his furious and implacable aversion to heretics.’ . . . Now, that this aversion formed, at any age, a prominent part of his character, will be asserted by no one who has studied the *whole* of his life. But in respect to this particular edict, was Mosheim ignorant that it was published under the regency of Queen Blanche, when the prince was not yet fifteen years old ?

‡ In 1239, one hundred and eighty heretics were burnt in Champagne, in the same flames, and in the presence of eighteen bishops. ‘It is a holocaust agreeable to God !’ exclaimed a monk who witnessed the execution. . . . Was it to be expected that a woman and a child should rise up against an ecclesiastical practice, which was sanctioned by the concurrent zeal of monks, of prelates, of popes, and of councils ?

§ Four of them are cited by Limborch, *Hist. of Inquisition*, lib. i. cap. 12.

¶ He was accused of having favoured and fostered heresies. His edicts *may* have had that tendency ; but he was assuredly innocent of the intention.

¶ Giannone (lib. xix., chap. v. sec. iv.) seems to ascribe the *establishment* of the court virtually administered by the Mendicants, to Innocent IV., and with truth, so far as Italy was concerned. Two circumstances (he remarks) were opposed to it. (1.) The judicial rights of the episcopal courts. (2.) The executive rights of the secular magistrates. The

made it most effectually the engine of the Vatican. It is true, that in this court the bishop was nominally appointed as coadjutor to the papal inquisitor; but all substantial judicial authority was placed in the hands of the latter*. The civil magistrate was likewise admitted to a seat among the members of the court; but in reality his power was ministerial only. The whole effective power, both judicial and executive, was vested in the Dominicans and Franciscans. . . . From Italy, the pestilence rapidly spread to the island of Sardinia, to Syria, and to Servia†. On the other hand into Spain, the field of its most destructive ravages, it was introduced so late as the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella—a reign more renowned, more panegyrised, than any other in the history of that country. But from Spain even the despotism of Charles V. was insufficient to communicate it to the rest of his subjects; the natural humanity of the Germans perseveringly repelled that pestilence; and the inhabitants of Naples on one side, and of the Low Countries on the other, resisted and rejected it with equal constancy.

We shall not enter more deeply into the records of the Inquisition, nor particularize the combinations of its machinery, and the exquisite harmony of its movements, because it did not reach that fatal perfection until a time posterior to the conclusion of this History‡. It is with no trifling satisfaction that we dispense with this labour; for the details of ingenious barbarity, though they may awaken a transient attention, convey little that is instructive to a reasonable mind; and the feelings of horror and indignation which they excite, do they not sometimes miss their true object, and exceed their just limits?—do they not sometimes rise into a detestation too general and too unqualified against the Church which permitted such iniquities?—do they not sometimes close our charities against fellow-Christians and fellow-Catholics, who perhaps abominate, as intensely as we do, the crimes of their ancestors? To expose the deviations from the precepts of the Gospel and the principles of philanthropy, into which the Church of Rome, in different ages, has fallen, is a painful task so commonly obtruded upon the historian, that he may well be spared the gratuitous denunciation of those which do not lie within the boundaries prescribed to his work.

first was obviated by the *nominal* association of bishops in the inquisitorial office. The second, by permitting the magistrate to have his minister in the court, though at the appointment of the grand inquisitor. There was much art in this concession; for thus, while the ecclesiastics really held the whole power, the secular authorities, by being united with them in name, were associated in hatred. They were tools,—they were mistaken for accomplices.

* We learn from Bzovius at a later period, (ann. 1302, sect. x.) that Boniface VIII. transferred the inquisitorial office from the Franciscans to the Dominicans, publishing at the same time some severe constitutions against heretics. There is one feature in them which we have not remarked in the earliest edicts. Not only were their defensores, receptatores, &c., included in the penalties, but also their *fili et nepotes*—children and grandchildren. The bishop of the diocese was *permitted* to act in concert with the inquisitors; and the investigation was ordered to proceed ‘*simpliciter et de plano, absque advocatorum et judiciorum strepitu et figura*!’ The accusers were allowed to give evidence secretly, if there should seem to be any danger to them from the publication of their names.

† Limborch, lib. i., cap. xvi. The ‘*Liber Sententiarum Inquisitionis Tholosanæ*,’ published at the end of his work, is of great value, not only as it faithfully represents the spirit of the ruling party in the Church at that time, (there were no doubt many *individuals* of greater moderation and humanity), but also as the best storehouse of the opinions with which the heretics were charged, and for which they suffered.

‡ It was indeed introduced into Spain under Pope Sixtus IV., before the close of the fifteenth century; but its first efforts, which were directed against the Jews, were merely characterized by savage barbarity.

SECTION III.

On the Gallican Liberties.

A difference which took place between St. Louis and his clergy, in the year 1263, throws some light both on his own character, and on the ecclesiastical history of the age. The *St. Louis and his Clergy.* bishops were desirous to make to the king a remonstrance from their whole body; and when they were admitted into his presence, the bishop of Auxerre spoke in their name as follows:—‘Sire, all these prelates here assembled desire me to say, that you are permitting the Christian religion to fall to ruins, and to crumble in your hands.’ On which the good king* made the sign of the Cross, and said, ‘Now tell me, bishop, how that is, and for what reason?’ ‘Sire,’ continued the bishop, ‘the evil is, that no regard is any longer paid to excommunication. In these days, a man would rather die under the sentence, than obtain absolution by making the necessary satisfaction to the Church. Wherefore, Sire, all these here present request, with one voice, that, for the honour of God, and in the discharge of your own duty †, it may please you to command all your bailiffs, provosts, and other administrators of justice, as follows:—that, if any one be found in your kingdom who shall have lain under a sentence of excommunication for a year and a day continuous, he be compelled, by seizure of his goods, to reconcile himself to the Church.’ The holy man (le saint homme) answered, that he would issue such order in respect to those who should be *proved* guilty of injustice either to the Church, or to their neighbour. The bishop pressed, in reply, the exclusive privileges of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; but the king firmly refused the secular aid, unless the nature of the offence, and the justice of the censure, should be such as required its interference. This was the endeavour of a wise prince to distinguish the boundaries of ecclesiastical and civil jurisdiction, and to restrain the former within its just limits; and it shows at least, that, on matters which were still left open to the exercise of reason, Louis, how much soever he might love the religion, was not at all disposed to be overreached or overawed by its ministers.

We may relate another anecdote of the same monarch, which will suggest one or two instructive reflections to the intelligent reader. St. Louis had promised to be present at a chapter-general of the Cistercian order, to be held in the year 1244 with unusual solemnity. Innocent IV. received information of his intention; and as the contest with Frederic involved him at that moment in some difficulties, he took measures to profit by the pious disposition of the king of France. The monarch arrived, attended by his mother, his brothers, and some nobles; and all the abbots and the monks of the community, consisting of five hundred, went forth in procession to meet and welcome the royal visitor. Immediately, while he was seated in the chapter, surrounded by his court, the abbots and the monks fell on their knees before him, with their hands in the attitude of

* Joinville, who tells the story, was present. Prem. Partie Vie de St. Louis, p. 24.

† ‘Pour Dieu, et pour ce qu’ ainsi le devez faire.’ We should observe that the demand on the part of the prelates was not new, and that it had even been granted by the predecessor of Louis. The first canon of the Council of Narbonne, held in 1227, mentions, as the law then in force, that whoever remained under the sentence, after three admonitions, should pay a fine of nine livres and a denier; but that whoever remained so for a whole year, should suffer the confiscation of all his property. Fleury, liv. lxxix. sec. xxxii.

prayer, and their eyes suffused with tears—for such had been the instructions of Innocent. Their prayer was this:—‘That, according to the ancient custom and liberty of France, he would protect their father and pastor, the holy pontiff, against the insults of the emperor; that he would receive him, if necessary, into the bosom of his kingdom, as Alexander had formerly been received, while flying before the Emperor Frederic, and Thomas of Canterbury, in his persecution by Henry of England.’ . . . St. Louis descended from his seat, and placed himself in like manner upon his knees before the holy suppliants. But his reply was dictated by the calmest prudence and policy—‘that he would defend the Church, as his honour required, from the insults of the emperor; and no less willingly would he receive the exiled Pope into his kingdom, if his barons should so counsel him; but that a king of France could on no occasion dispense with the counsels of his nobles*.’ . . . It was no secret from the king, nor, perhaps, even from his monastic petitioners, that the barons of France, would never consent to open their rich domains, as a refuge for the rapacious court of Innocent IV.

If St. Louis, on the one hand, protected the liberties of his lay-subjects from the usurpations of the clergy, he was no less vigilant, on the other, in shielding all parties from the increasing exactions of Rome. Even from very early ages the Church of France had exhibited on some important occasions marks both of independence and good sense, above the level of other nations. The oriental absurdity of the Stylites was rejected by that more rational people. The rising authority of St. Leo was unable to silence the refractory bishops of France. The use of images was for some time discountenanced in that country. The Augustinian doctrine of predestination found, perhaps, its warmest adversaries among the divines of France. But most especially in the contest of Hincmar with Pope Nicholas, and some other occurrences of the ninth century, do we detect the spirit of a clergy not prepared to pay implicit obedience to the *foreign* autocrat of the Church. Nevertheless, no formal declaration of resistance—no national attempt to emancipate the Gallican Church from any of its fetters, or give it security by a separate constitution against further aggressions—had hitherto been made by any king of France.

It was the last among the legislative acts of St. Louis to publish those institutions which formed the basis of the boasted ‘*Liberties of the Gallican Church*.’ Just before his departure for Tunis, he issued his *Pragmatic Sanction*. It was founded on the necessity of distinguishing temporal from spiritual authority, and became, in after times, the foundation of a more extensive emancipation. Like those, however, which were built upon it, it was peculiarly directed against the pecuniary usurpations of Rome, and her claims to the patronage of the Church. The latter subject had indeed occasioned the earliest contentions between the empire and the Vatican, at a time when the rights of the dispute were on the side of the latter. But since the days of Innocent II., the usurpations, whether in the imposition of taxes, or the distribution of benefices, had proceeded from the court of Rome; and Louis IX. having acquired by his personal character, as well as his wise ‘*Establishments* †,’ the affection and fidelity of his subjects, felt strong enough to repress them.

* See Matthew Paris, ad ann. 1244. We must not confound this affair with a conference which did actually take place two years afterwards between the king and the Pope within the walls of Cluni. See Pagi, Vit. Innoc. IV., sec. xxxiii.

† The ‘*Establishments of St. Louis*’ belong, for the most part, to civil history. It is

Accordingly, in the year 1209, that he might ensure the tranquillity of his Church and kingdom during his absence, and also secure for his enterprise the protection of God, he promulgated his celebrated Ordinance. It is comprised in six articles. (1.) The churches, the prelates, the patrons, and the ordinary collators of benefices, shall enjoy their rights to their full extent, and each shall be sustained in his jurisdiction. (2.) The cathedral and other churches shall possess the liberties of elections, which shall be carried into complete effect. (3.) We will, that simony, the pest of the Church, be wholly banished from our kingdom. (4.) Promotions, collations, provisions and dispositions of prelatures, dignities, and other ecclesiastical benefices and offices, whatsoever they may be, shall be made according to the institutions of common law, of the councils, and of our ancient Fathers. (5.) We renew and approve of the liberties, franchises, prerogatives, and privileges, granted by the kings our predecessors, and by ourselves, to churches, monasteries, and other places of piety, as well as to ecclesiastical persons: (6.) We prohibit any one from, in any manner, levying and collecting the pecuniary exactions and heavy charges which the Court of Rome has imposed, or may hereafter impose, upon the Church of our kingdom, and by which it has been miserably impoverished—unless it be for a reasonable and very urgent cause, or by inevitable necessity, and with the free and express consent of the king and of the Church*.

Six years earlier, when the archbishop of Tyre arrived in France, as the legate of the Holy See, to impose a contribution on the clergy for the cost of a holy† war, an assembly of bishops referred his Bull to the king, and ordained that, if any chose to accede to the claim, they would do so by their own free will, not through any legal compulsion from Rome. . . It is obvious, from these occasional ebullitions, to observe, that the sordid policy of Innocent IV. was already producing its effect, in disposing the secular clergy to resist the despotism of Rome. Fifty years had not yet elapsed from the death of that pontiff, when we find the prelacy of France placed in direct opposition‡ to the Vatican, and a politic prince availing himself of that spirit to the disadvantage of the Holy See. As long as the

only necessary to observe, that though many particular enactments were severe, and even barbarous, according to the estimation of a civilized age, they were founded upon principles of policy, and even humanity, far above those of the times in which they were promulgated. *Le Roi (says Millot) devient législateur: l'anarchie féodale devoit finir.* Another half century, and it did so.

* 'Item exactiones et onera gravissima pecuniarum per Curiam Romanam Ecclesiæ regni nostri impositas vel imposita, quibus regnum nostrum miserabiliter depauperatum extitit, sive etiam imponendas vel imponenda, levare aut colligi nullatenus volumus, nisi duntaxat pro rationabili, pia et urgentissima causa, vel inevitabili necessitate, ac de spontaneo ac expresso consensu nostro et ipsius Ecclesiæ regni nostri.' . . There are some copies in which the last article does not appear. But there is more reason for the opinion, that it was curtailed in these, than interpolated in the rest. Though the other articles do not make express mention of the court of Rome, yet it seems clear that the second, third, fourth, and a part of the first, are levelled against it. See Fleury, liv. lxxxvi. sec. i. Dupin. *Nouv. Biblioth.*, sec. xiii. chap. vii. The act was cited, as here given, by the Parliament to Louis XI., in 1483, and in the Act of Appeal of the University of Paris, in 1495.

† The Declaration of the bishops is given by Menard in his notes on Joinville, p. 287.

‡ The same spirit, of course, extended itself to the lower clergy. It was during this reign that a Curé at Paris thus addressed his congregation.—'You know, my brethren, that I am ordered to publish an excommunication against Frederic (II). I am ignorant of the motive. I am only certain that there has been a quarrel between that prince and the Pope—God alone knows which is right. I excommunicate him who has injured the other, and absolve him who has suffered the injury.' The congregation were amused with the sally. The emperor is said to have sent a present to the preacher; but the Pope condemned him to canonical penance; and he performed it accordingly.

Popes were contented to make common cause with their clergy against the secular authorities, they were indeed strong and formidable. But when they openly distinguished between the interests of the court of Rome and of the rest of the hierarchy—when they proceeded to supply the luxuries, or forward the ambitious projects of the one by invading the revenues of the other—from that moment the despotism of the apostolical Chair, notwithstanding the swarm of Mendicants which it created for its defence, had parted with its only ground or hope of permanence.

SECTION IV.

On the Crusades.

‘The report of the Council of Clermont wafted a cheering gale over the minds of Christians. There was no nation so remote, no people so retired, as did not respond to the papal wishes. This ardent wish not only inspired the continental provinces, but the most distant islands and savage countries *.’ Accordingly a mighty mass of fanaticism put itself in motion towards the East. The frame of society was convulsed, and seemingly dissolved; and as the will of Heaven is not uncommonly pleaded to justify the extravagance of man, the phenomena of the physical world were pressed into the same adventure: meteors and exhalations pointed out the road to Jerusalem, and the most ordinary signs of nature became portents and prodigies. The first burst of the storm fell upon some miserable Jews, who were living in peace under Christian protection, and many were massacred. It then rolled onwards; and the follies, the sufferings, and the crimes, which marked the progress of the first crusade, have not ever been equalled in the history of human madness. Nevertheless, as a military enterprize, it was successful. Some exploits were performed of extraordinary daring. The same agency which had lighted the flame was at hand to nourish it on every occasion of disaster; and the spirit that was chilled by famine or by fear, was immediately revived and inflamed by some new and stupendous miracle. Men who could be brought really to believe, while under the endurance of the most frightful reverses, that the favour of God was especially extended and continually manifested to them, were capable of more than human exertion; the entire abandonment of reason left space for the operation of energies which do not properly belong to man.

The victory of Doryleum was followed by the siege of Antioch; the capture of that city led the way to the investment of Jerusalem itself; and the banner of the cross was finally planted on Mount Sion amidst horrors, which probably had not been paralleled since the triumph of Titus over the same devoted city. Respecting the double massacre inflicted upon the infidels, we shall merely remark, that it had not the excuse of hasty uncontrollable passion, but that it was designed and deliberate. A deeply settled resolution of revenge may have had some share in the deed, but the policy of extermination had probably more; and the spirit of religious persecution certainly directed the weapons and poisoned the wounds. In the mean time, *Deus el volt*—it is the will of God—was the watchword and the battle-shout of the Christians; it overpowered the prayers of the

* Malmsbury, p. 416. He continues: ‘The Welshman left his hunting; the Scotch his fellowship with vermin; the Dane his drinking party; the Norwegian his raw fish.’

women and the screams of their dying children * ; and was then loudest upon Sion and Calvary when the commandments of God and Christ were most insultingly violated.

The loss of the Crusaders, in this first enterprize, is calculated with probability at about 1,200,000 lives ; but the Holy Sepulchre was freed from the pollution of the infidel ; and, what perhaps was of more consequence, as respects the continuance of similar expeditions, a Latin kingdom was established in Jerusalem. It is remarkable, that not one of the sovereigns of Europe adventured his person, or even deeply risked his reputation, in the unknown perils of the first crusade. But, nearly fifty years afterwards, the loss of Edessa, and some other reverses in the East, awakened the sympathy of Louis VII. of France and Conrad III. of Germany, and they determined to aid an afflicted Christian and a brother king. For this purpose it was necessary to rouse the fury of Europe a second time ; and the eager co-operation of St. Bernard secured success. A less powerful instrument might have answered the object. Any intemperate enthusiast † can excite his fellow-mortals to deeds of wickedness ; the genius of St. Bernard was given him to do good to mankind—but it was contracted by the severity of monastic discipline ; it was stained with the prejudices of an ignorant age ; it was distorted by the very austerity of his virtues ; it was misdirected even by his piety. He entered with ardour upon his mission of evil. He traversed fruitful provinces and populous cities. Vast multitudes everywhere assembled to applaud and to listen ; and the energy of his delivery and the vehemence of his tones and action, roused the feelings of many, who were even ignorant of the language in which he addressed them ‡. Such excitement, in a matter where passion and not reason was engaged, produced every effect of persuasion ; and if, besides, there were any so torpid, as to resist the natural eloquence of the holy man, he enjoyed that other resource, so potent in its influence where all the ordinary operations of the mind are suspended,—he possessed the gift of miracles, and proved his heavenly mission (so his credulous panegyrists assert) by many preternatural signs. At the same time he affected, by a more dangerous assumption, the prophetic character ; and, on the faith of Him, who can neither err nor deceive, he foretold and promised a splendid career of triumphs. Armed with so full and various a quiver against the feeble reason of a superstitious generation—with high personal celebrity and eloquence ; with the support of powerful princes ; with pontifical approbation ; with the repute of supernatural aid, and pretensions to heavenly inspiration—what wonder was it that St. Bernard confounded the sense and broke up the repose of Europe ; that he depopulated cities

* Christiani sic neci totum laxaverant animum, ut nec sugens masculus, aut femina, nedum infans unius anni vivens manum percussoris evaderet.—Albert, p. 283, cited by Mills, Hist. Crusades, chap. vi.

† It is amusing to observe the contempt with which the Abbot of Clairvaux speaks of the hermit-preacher of the first crusade : ' Fuit in priori expeditione, antequam Hierosolyma caperetur, vir quidam, Petrus nomine, cujus et vos (ni fallor) sæpe mentionem audistis,' &c.—Bernard. Epist. 363, p. 328, vol. i. ed. Mabil. The reference is made by Mills, Hist. Crusades, chap. ix.

‡ Latin was the language which he indiscriminately addressed to the vulgar in all the provinces in which he preached. Since preternatural powers have been ascribed to him, it has been thought remarkable that the gift, of which he seemed to stand most in need, was perversely withheld,

and provinces (such was his own rash boast), and sent forth the whole flower and vigour of Christendom on the holy enterprize!

The history of religious war has not recorded any expedition at the same time more fatal and more fruitless, than the crusade of St. Bernard. After two or three years of suffering and disaster almost uninterrupted, a miserable remnant of survivors returned to relate their misfortunes and marvel at their discomfiture. A general outcry was raised against the author of those calamities; innumerable widows and orphans demanded of the prophet their husbands and their sires; or at least they claimed the sacred laurels which he had promised—the triumphs which he had vouchsafed, in his dispensation of the boons of heaven, to the soldiers of the cross. The detected impostor was not ashamed to take shelter under the usual pretext of religious hypocrites. He asserted that his prophecies (the prophecies of God) were only conditional; that in foretelling the success of the crusaders, he had *assumed* their righteousness and the purity of their lives; that their own enormous crimes had diverted or suspended the designs of Providence, just as in ancient days the sins of the Jews in the wilderness had foiled the policy and foresight of Moses *. If at any time we can regard with levity any pious artifice of the meanest ecclesiastic for the most innocent purpose, still our smile is not unmixed with melancholy or contempt. But the crime of St. Bernard, the most enlightened prelate of his time, who usurped the attributes and forged the seal of God, in order to launch some hundreds of thousands of confiding Christians into probable destruction, or at best into successful massacre, excites a serious indignation, which it would be partial to suppress, and which neither his talents, nor his virtues, nor his piety, nor the vicious principles of his age, are sufficient to remove.

Forty years after the departure of this expedition, in the year 1187, Saladin gained the battle of Tiberias, and soon afterwards recovered from the Christians the possession of the Holy City. The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem had struggled through eighty-eight years of precarious existence against internal dissension and tumult, and the perpetual aggressions of the infidel. Perhaps it must have yielded under any circumstances to the genius of Saladin; but its fate was precipitated by the feudal divisions of its defenders, the jealousy subsisting between the Knights of the Temple and those of the Hospital, and the violent quarrels in which the latter were engaged, through the effect of their papal immunities, with the avareicious hierarchy of Palestine †.

The Third crusade (1189—92) was distinguished by the adventures of the lion-hearted Richard. The Fourth followed only three years after—

* This celebrated passage is in the beginning of the second book of his Treatise, 'De Consideratione,' addressed to Pope Eugenius III., and should be cited:—'Moysees educturus populum de terra Ægypti meliorem illis pollicitus est terram. Nam quando ipsum aliter sequeretur populus, solam sapiens terram? Eduxit; eductos tamen in terram quam promiserat non introduxit. Nec est quod ducis temeritati imputari queat tristis et inopinatus eventus. Omnia faciebat Domino imperante, Domino cooperante, et opus confirmante sequentibus signis. Sed populus ille, inquis, duræ cervicis fuit, semper contentiosè agens contra Dominum et contra Moysem servum ejus. Bene illi creduli et rebelles—Hi autem quid? Ipsos interroga. Quid me dicere opus est quod fatentur ipsi? Dico ergo unum—Quid poterant conficere, qui semper revertebantur, cum ambularent? Quando et isti per totam viam non redierunt corde in Ægyptum? Quod si illi ceciderunt et perierunt propter iniquitatem suam, miramur istos, eadem facientes, eadem passos! Sed numquid illorum casus adversus promissa Dei? Ergo, nec istorum. Neque enim aliquando promissiones Dei justitiæ Dei præjudicant.'

† This subject will be again mentioned in the twenty-sixth chapter.

wards, under the auspices of Pope Celestine III., and terminated in inglorious failure. The Germans, of whom it chiefly consisted, accused the faint co-operation of the barons resident in the Holy Land. The Fifth and Sixth were created, or at least protected and fostered, by Innocent III. The former of these may possibly be ascribed to the still surviving spirit of popular superstition, lashed into fanaticism by the preaching, or at least by the miraculous pretensions, of an enthusiast named Fulk. But whatever may have been its origin, its termination—the capture of Constantinople—was certainly neither foreseen nor designed by its advocates. The warriors of the sixth crusade likewise declined from the original object of these military pilgrimages, and deviated, with greater promise of profit if not of glory, into the wealthy plains of Egypt. Their courage was repaid by the conquest of Damietta; but the advantage thus obtained was neither great nor permanent. The force of the Christians in the East was weakened by division, and they were contented to despoil what they could not hope to possess. Still, if we are to assign to this expedition the concluding exertions of Frederic II., it terminated with more honour to the Christian name, and with a nearer approach to the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre, than any which had been undertaken since the first. And that its results were not more lasting, is to be ascribed, not to the insincerity of the emperor, but to the narrow jealousy of a passionate pope *, who roused all his military and monastic myrmidons in opposition to that very cause which he, as well as his faithless predecessor, had dared to designate the cause of God.

The chivalrous enterprize of the Count of Champagne, and Richard Earl of Cornwall, followed the council of Spoleto, in 1234; and the imperfect success, which attended *Those of St. Louis*, it, was rather occasioned by the dissensions of the Mussulman princes, than by the cordial co-operation of the Christians. It added one to the list of the crusades; and was presently succeeded by two others, the Eighth and Ninth, with which the melancholy catalogue at length concluded. Both of these may probably be attributed to the religious fervour of St. Louis. In the access of a dangerous sickness, in the year 1244, that prince vowed the sacrifice of his personal service to God, should his health providentially be restored. It was so. In the following year, the numerous host of prelates, assembled at the council of Lyons, proclaimed the crusade, and enjoined four preparatory years of peace and seriousness throughout the western nations. During this interval large contributions were levied both on the clergy and laity; and other effectual means adopted to secure success; and at its expiration, the pious monarch spread his sails for the East. His immediate object, however, was not the liberation of the Sepulchre, but the conquest of Egypt; and in the conduct of this campaign he closely imitated both the gallantry and the errors of his predecessors, who had triumphed and perished in the same field. The misfortunes of the sixth crusade, though still fresh in the memory of mankind, taught as usual no lesson and conveyed no warning to the generation which followed; and the repetition of similar blunders only led to a more disastrous result. The army

* Gregory IX. Innocent III. died before the departure of the expedition, which he had been particularly and personally diligent in promoting. See the preceding chapter. Not professing to give a regular history of these various expeditions, nor to mention more facts than are necessary for our inferences, we have not noticed the celebrated Crusade of Children under this pope; yet it may fairly be considered as the consummation of the work of fanaticism.

was defeated, and Louis himself fell a captive into the power of the infidel. But his follies were redeemed by the gold of his subjects; and he returned to expiate his fatal enthusiasm by the exercise of peaceful virtues, and to repair, by useful and humane institutions, the wrongs which he had done to his people.

But the spark of superstition was neither extinguished by the discharge of his best duties, nor chilled by the advance of age. After an interval of twenty years of wisdom, he relapsed into the old infatuation, and unfurled, for the last time, the consecrated banner of fanaticism. His second expedition consisted, for the most part, as the first had done, of French and English; and, like the first, it was again directed against the Moslems of Africa, not against the usurpers of the Holy Land. The heroic plains of Carthage were occupied by the Christian force; and the tombs of Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustin may perhaps have been rescued from the pollutions of the unbeliever; but the army was still encamped, without any decisive success, before the walls of Tunis, when St. Louis was called away for ever from the sanguinary scene.

His death was immediately followed by the romantic adventures of the English Edward, which closed the long succession of fruitless efforts for a worthless object. The power of the Infidel presently increased in might and boldness; and, in the year 1291, the last fragments of Christian rule were swept away from the surface of Palestine. . . Acre, the conquest of the English hero, was the last possession of the Cross: it had long been the only strong bulwark against the Moslem force. It was important, through its situation at the end of that large and fertile plain which extends to the Jordan eastward, and which has been the field of decisive conflicts in every age of the history of Palestine; it was important, as the centre of commercial intercourse between the east and the west, the resort of all nations and all languages. But the universal profligacy which prevailed within its walls, and the crimes with which it was stained, beyond the shame of any other Christian city, were thought to justify the judgment of God, when at length he delivered it over to a Mahometan conqueror*.

To this hasty, but necessary outline of the history of the Crusades, we are called upon to subjoin some general observations on their causes, their objects, and their results: not *The Causes of the* aspiring to emulate the eloquence with which this *Crusades.* subject has been so commonly treated, nor affecting to add anything original in thought or expression to the successful labours of our predecessors; but simply to justify the pretensions of this work, which would vainly assume the title of an Ecclesiastical History, if it should pass in entire silence over the most amazing phenomena, which ever proceeded from the abuse of religion. And if, indeed, it be a true reflection, that the only enterprize, in which the nations of Europe have at any time engaged with a single arm and a common soul,—and that, too, no vague and transient adventure, but the passion or policy of two hundred years,—stands singularly marked in the historic temple, as a monument of human absurdity: if this be true, is it possible to search too frequently for the sources of such unanimous infatuation, or to ascertain too minutely what passions or what prejudices, or what interests those were, which availed to

* 'E questo pericolo non fù senza grande e giusto giudizio di Dio, che quella città era piena di più peccatori uomini e femine d'ogni dissoluto peccato, che terra chi fosse tra' Christiani. Giovanni Villani, lib. vii., c. 144, as cited by Mills, *Hist. Crusades*.

dispossess and enchain for so long a period the reason of mankind? Moreover, as we have found occasion to observe, that an indulgent Providence will sometimes extract blessings from man's blindest follies, it becomes us also to inquire, whether the fruits of those wild enterprizes were any other than shame, degradation, and misery. Though, indeed, in this case, it might seem presumptuous to look for any manifestation of divine compassion, where impiety called itself religious devotion, and massacre pleaded for reward, and pleaded in the blessed name of Christ.

To visit the spots which have been consecrated by immortal deeds,—to tread in the footsteps which those have traced whose memory we love and revere,—is the suggestion of natural *Pilgrimage*. piety, not the maxim or observance of religion. Nevertheless, such practice is easily associated with any religion, whenever the qualities of its founder have been such as to excite the enthusiasm of its votaries; and thus the performance of holy pilgrimage became an early, a frequent, and almost a peculiar usage of the Christians. From an innocent, perhaps useful custom, it was gradually exalted into a spiritual duty; and the journey to the sepulchre of the Saviour was encouraged and enjoined by some of the oldest Fathers of the established Church. The pure principle of pilgrimage was presently mixed and alloyed by vulgar motives: a faint shade of superstition was insensibly heightened into a darker; and the traveller returned from the holy places, no longer satisfied with the consciousness of pious intent and sincere devotion, but also charged with relics of departed saints, or fragments of the holy crown or cross. . . . This degenerate passion was nourished by the rulers of the church; multitudes thirsted for those vain possessions, whom a mere ardour to worship at the tomb of Christ would scarcely have fortified against the toils of the journey; the Syrian dispensers of the profitable patrimony unceasingly discovered new treasures by revelation, or multiplied the original by miracles; so that the crowds who thronged the sanctuary perpetually increased, and the sources which fed their credulity were never closed nor lessened.

It was natural to expect that the conquest of Palestine by the unbelieving Saracens would have abolished the means, if it did not desecrate the objects, of pilgrimage. But it proved otherwise. The enlightened Caliphs immediately perceived the policy of toleration; they saw the direct advantages which flowed into Syria through the superstition and commerce of the West; they may even have learned from their own practice to respect the motives of the travellers, and the kindred passion which occasioned an annual visit to the Christian Mecca. Certainly they received the visitors without insult, and dismissed them without injury.

During the concluding portion of the tenth century, a strange impulse was given to the spirit of pilgrimage by an accidental cause, which, as it was sown in delusion, produced the customary harvest of wickedness. The belief prevailed of the approaching dissolution of the world and the termination of earthly things; Mount Sion was to become the judgment-seat of the Most High; and the Christian nations were taught to depart and humble themselves before his throne. Those interested exhortations were too obsequiously obeyed; and though the notion which created them was after a few years falsified and exploded, yet the habit of journeying to the Holy Land had in the meantime gained great prevalence, and the idea of an expiatory obligation became commonly attached to it. In the century following, the journey assumed not unfrequently the form of an expedition, and was sometimes undertaken by considerable bodies of associated

and even armed devotees. We still peruse, in the narrative of Ingulphus, a native and historian of England, the adventures of seven thousand holy Germans, who engaged in the enterprize under the direction of the archbishop of Mayence, and in the society of thirty Norman horsemen. They encountered many dangers and suffered many losses; but they attained their object, and worshipped at the fountain of their religion. And when they recounted, in domestic security, their various fortunes, their listeners were more likely to be inflamed by the admiration of their success, than deterred by sufferings or perils, which greater foresight or felicity might easily ward off from themselves.

Towards the close of the eleventh age, about the year 1076, the dominion of Palestine was torn from the Arabian dynasty by the wilder hand of the Turks. The pure fanaticism of that rude people was not yet softened by friendly intercourse with the followers of the adverse faith, nor would it stoop to yield even to the obvious dictates of interest. Many outrages were at this time unquestionably perpetrated upon the strangers who visited the sepulchre, and upon the Christian natives and sojourners in Syria. Those who returned from the East were clamorous in their descriptions and their complaints; and tales of suffering and of sacrilege, of the prostration of Christ's followers, the profanation of his name, the pollution of his holy places, tales of Moslem oppression and impiety, were diffused and exaggerated and believed, with fierce and revengeful indignation, from one end of Europe to the other.

Whatsoever may have been the merits of the feudal principles in earlier times, they had degenerated, in the eleventh century, into a mere code of military service and subordination. The whole business, the pleasure, the passion of that age was war. It animated alike the cities and the villages; it presided over the domestic regulations of every family; it was familiar with the thoughts, where it did not constitute the habits, of every individual. Even the higher orders of the clergy forgot their spiritual in their secular obligations, and very commonly engaged in the same pursuits from a common necessity*. It was in vain that Charlemagne had restrained by his Capitularies that preposterous practice. The policy of Charlemagne was too wise for the times in which he lived: he attempted to anticipate the operation of progressive ages; he enacted some useful laws; but he was unable to perpetuate a premature, and therefore transient, civilization. No sooner was he removed by death than inveterate barbarism resumed its sway, and the bulwark which his single hand had raised against the principles, customs, and prejudices of ancestral ignorance, was hastily swept away. During the two centuries which followed, in spite of the general exertions of the clergy, as a body, to arrest the desolating spirit, in spite of canonical legislation and ecclesiastical censure, the practice of private warfare continued with no mitigation. Early in the eleventh age, the *Treuga Dei* (the Truce of God) was solemnly enjoined, with the purpose of enforcing a suspension of hostilities during certain days in every week. But though this humane ordinance was frequently confirmed and reiterated, there was no age in which the military frenzy had such general prevalence throughout Europe, none in which

* *Olim* (says Guido, abbot of Clairville) *non habebant castella et arces ecclesie cathedralis, nec incedebant pontifices loricati. Sed nunc, propter abundantiam temporalium rerum, flamma, ferro, cæde possessiones ecclesiarum prælati defendunt, quas deberent pauperibus erogare.* Du Cange, *Gloss. Lat., art. Advocatus.* The abbot's *olim* extended through the first five centuries, and not much later.

the exercise of arms and the effusion of blood were so completely the habit, the motive, almost the morality, of the western nations.

At a period when religious notions or observances were mingled with all customs and all institutions, and thus interwoven with the whole texture of private as well as public *Superstitious zeal.* life,—and when, besides, the corruptions of Christianity had so superseded its genuine spirit, that the notions which we have called religious should rather have been designated superstitious,—the ruling passion of the age was easily associated with its ruling weakness. Martial enterprise went hand in hand with enthusiasm, misnamed pious; the exploits of the one were consecrated by the expressions, sometimes by the feelings, of the other; and the words of the priest were repeated, or the image of the Saviour embraced, even in the fiercest moments of the strife. Abject ignorance, followed by credulity, held dominion almost undisputed; and the minds of men were destitute of any moral principles to restrain, or any moral knowledge to direct, the course of their passions. The faculties which distinguish sense from absurdity, piety from fanaticism, truth from falsehood and imposture, were extinct or dormant; and a restless and irrational generation lay exposed to the impulse of any rising tempest.

On such an age and race,—so inured to the use of arms, so alive to the emotions of religion, so familiar with the practice of holy pilgrimage,—the indignity of Turkish oppression, the outrages on the name and sepulchre of Christ, fell with an electric efficacy. At another time, under other circumstances, the bolt might have passed by unfelt and almost unheeded; but at that moment it was no premature nor unseasonable visitation, but it found men prepared, and intensely sensible to its operation; and the flash which attended it descended on materials prepared for explosion.

It argues a superficial knowledge both of nature and of history to suppose that a phenomenon, so astounding as the first crusade, could have been produced in any condition of society without strong predetermining causes; and that the preaching of the Hermit or even the indulgences of the Pope could have excited to that enterprise minds, that were not deeply disposed to receive the impulse. There are some, indeed, who consider the increase of pontifical power during the eleventh age, under the auspices of Hildebrand, to have been a leading cause in producing the Crusades. It is true that, a century earlier, the aspirations of Sylvester II. were without effect: it is more remarkable that even Gregory himself, though professing an ardent and even personal eagerness for the enterprise, carried his project to no result; while Urban, with much less individual influence, accomplished the work with great facility. But in the time of Sylvester, some of the popular motives for the crusade did not yet exist, others had not attained sufficient prevalence and maturity; and Gregory was diverted from his scheme by the more pressing solicitations of domestic ambition. But when Urban threw the torch among the multitudes of Placentia and Clermont, their hands were prepared and eager to seize it, and extinguish it in Moslem blood. A pilgrimage to the sepulchre of Christ was then a common and almost customary act of devotion; a pilgrimage in arms was congenial with the spirit of a warlike race; to liberate the holy places and to chastise the usurpers were objects consistent with each other, and with the ruling principles of the age.

And such were the *objects* of the first crusade—to deliver the Holy Land from a state of imaginary pollution, and to take vengeance on the infidel possessor. No consideration of distant consequences, nor even of

immediate utility, entered into them. Reason was not consulted, nor were her precincts approached: of the passions themselves, those most akin to reason had no share in the *first Crusade*. *Objects of the first Crusade.* Ambition was silent in the uproar*. Policy might, indeed, have offered plausible justification, by suggesting that the hurricane which had wasted Asia might presently break over Europe; but the *argumenta justi metus*, if they have satisfied some writers on this subject, entered not in any degree into the motives of the Crusaders. They were not men to calculate remote dangers; still less did they perplex themselves with any theoretical speculation as to the right of hostility, or seek their excuse in the antichristian *principles* of their enemy. From the rule and practice of Mahometan aggression, they might almost have inferred the right of reciprocal invasion; but they looked for immortality, not for justification; it never occurred to them to doubt the justice, or rather the holiness, of their cause; they sought no plea or pretext, except in the passion of their religious frenzy and in the sharpness of their sword.

There was still another motive which might have seemed substantial to the warriors of those days, and which they might equally have borrowed from the Infidel—a design to convert the miscreants by force, and to drag them in chains to the waters of baptism; but even this project held no place among the incentives to the *first crusade*. In later times, indeed, when in the vicissitudes of military adventure the arms of the Mahometan were found to preponderate, some faint attempts were made, or meditated†, to convince those whom it proved impossible to subdue; but the earliest soldiers of the Cross were moved by no such design: they rushed in thoughtless precipitation to an unprofitable end, and they believed that a Power irresistibly impelled them, and that that Power was—the Will of God.

These remarks are properly confined to the origin of the first crusade—to that burst of pure fanaticism which was itself unmixed with worldly incentives, though it opened the field for other enterprises, proceeding from the usual motives of human action. An inattention to this distinction has misled some writers, who, failing to discriminate between the circumstances which produced, and those which nourished, the crusades, have not taken an accurate view of either. A multitude of causes combined to impel the machine when it was once in motion, though the agency which launched it was simple and uniform. In the first place, by the success of the first expedition, an important kingdom was established in the East. Immediately measures were taken to provide for its protection, and secure its stability. Natives of most of the western states settled in Palestine. The *Latin* colony adopted the feudal discipline, and the common constitution of Europe. Hence a thousand links were extended of sympathy and of interest; and together they formed an

* The success which had attended the Asiatic, and even Syrian, campaigns of Nicephorus, Phocas, and John Zimisces (963—975) might have offered reasonable hopes to the ambition of the Crusaders, and almost justified the military policy of the expedition—if ambition or policy had ever entered into their consideration.

† In 1285, Honorius IV., in order to convert the Saracens, strove to establish at Paris schools for Arabic and other oriental languages. The Council of Vienna, in 1312, recommended the same method; and Oxford, Salamanca, Bologna, as well as Paris, were places selected for the establishment of the Professorships. But the decree appears to have remained without effect, until Francis I. called it into life.

entirely new ground for exertion, and gave a different character to the movement which agitated the West. Henceforward, reciprocal relations existed; the honour of Christendom was now engaged to maintain its conquests over the unbeliever; it was held base to relinquish a possession, acquired through so many losses, even by those who might not think the losses counterbalanced by the possession. It is one thing to rush into a desperate enterprise, and another to encounter some additional risk in defence of that, which by much previous risk has been achieved.

Not one of the sovereigns of Europe was either personally engaged in the first crusade, or very zealous in promoting it: it proceeded from sources wholly distinct from the policy of courts and the springs of civil government. But the second, and most of the following expeditions, were undertaken, some with the aid and countenance, others under the very authority and direction, of the leading monarchs. It is unnecessary to observe how many different ingredients were thrown into the cup of fanaticism by such co-operation,—obedience to the command, affection for the person, gratitude for the favour, hope from the generosity, of the prince—and, what was scarcely less potent than these, the seal of approbation which stamped the practice, which gave it prevalence and fashion, which placed it among the ordinary means of distinction, among the legitimate duties of military service. . . . Again, the policy, which mixed itself almost necessarily with the royal motives, entirely lost sight in some cases of the original object. The pollution of the holy places was forgotten in the fruitful prospect of the plains of Egypt, or of the commerce which thronged the African ports; in such manner, as to make it very questionable whether plunder, rather than conquest, was not the principal motive of three, at least, among the latest crusades. St. Louis himself was, perhaps, as politic as he was pious; and it is not easy to perceive how the sufferings of the Holy Land could have been much alleviated by any advantages which he might have achieved before the walls of Tunis. At any rate, though the same vows and intentions might still be professed, very different incentives were certainly proposed, and very different methods adopted, to accomplish them.

The principles and motives of the Vatican, which are generally found so consistent, were subject to some fluctuation in the encouragement which it extended to the crusades. The feeling of Sylvester appears to have been the anticipation of that, which animated the first adventurers a century afterwards. Gregory VII. had more specific and tangible objects. His practical mind was not perhaps much moved by the tears of Palestine and the tales of her pollution; but he considered the union of the rival churches, and the general triumph of the Christian over the Moslem cause, as projects not unworthy of the confederacy of the West, and of his own superintendence.

The Popes of the 12th century followed, where they did not direct or inflame, the passion of their age; and the successive armaments of martyrs were launched with the apostolical benediction on their holy destination. But the designs of Innocent III. were of a different and more selfish description; and he did not fear to pervert to their accomplishment the machine entrusted to him for other purposes. The arms which had been consecrated to the service of Christ, against the blasphemers of his name, were now turned against the domestic adversaries of the See of Rome. The views and policy of Innocent were purely ecclesiastical; they did not extend in any direction beyond the interests

of the Church over which he presided; and it was the impulse of the moment to crush the foe in his bosom, before he sought for a remote and defensive enemy.

When the precedent of converting the banner of the Cross into a badge of Papal subservience was once established, the name and object of a holy war passed through different methods of profanation; and the sword of the Crusader, after being steeped in heretical blood, was drawn, in the same hateful service, against a Catholic adversary. The Popes had thus accomplished their final object in substituting the defence of the Church—which really meant the temporal interests of the See of Rome—as a recognized object for arming the subjects of all governments, in the name of Christ; and to this purpose the plenary indulgence, still the great lever of popular fanaticism, was commonly and not vainly applied.

From that time forward it does not appear that the Vatican pursued any fixed policy respecting the expeditions really undertaken for the chastisement of the Infidel. Its general voice was indeed loud in their favour; and bulls and exhortations were perpetually promulgated to quicken or revive the ardour of the Faithful. Notwithstanding, there were particular occasions—such as the attempts of Frédéric II. and the Seventh Crusade—on which the pontifical power was employed to thwart, or even to prevent, the enterprise. But the secret of this fluctuation was too often and too openly betrayed. The advantage and aggrandizement of Rome was now become in papal eyes the only legitimate object of the religious spirit; and, according to the more modern and favourite method, she now turned that spirit into the channel of her avarice. The Indulgence, which in the first instance was only granted as the reward of actual service in the holy cause, was, in process of time, publicly exchanged for gold; and the timid or indolent devotee was first permitted, and afterwards encouraged, to redeem by his wealth the toils and dangers of a military penance. Again: Innocent III. had taxed the clergy of Europe for the benefit of the Holy Land; but presently we find complaints, that the tax was become the object, instead of the means, and the crusade only the pretext. And thus the treasury of Rome was filled, amidst the disappointment of all honest enthusiasts and the murmurs of a defrauded priesthood. The memory of Gregory VII., and the fame of his spiritual triumph and lofty ambition, were put to shame by the sordid cupidity of his degenerate successors.

The above observations are sufficient to show how widely both the causes and objects of the Crusades varied during the long period of their continuance, and how far they sometimes deviated from the pure martial fanaticism of their origin. As they were thus mixed up with the ordinary motives of policy, and were degraded to the selfish service of Rome, so the fuel by which they were nourished gradually disappeared, and the flame insensibly burnt out; and in this circumstance we observe the limits to which the influence of the Vatican itself was confined. When popular spirit was kindled by other causes, the Pope was abundantly powerful to fan and excite it; when it had risen to the height of its fury, he had control sufficient to misdirect it; but when it began to sink and die away, his utmost efforts were unable to sustain or revive it. As long as the Vatican was contented to feed and minister to the universal passion, its influence, which was really great, appeared to have no bounds; but when that passion had once subsided, the Pontiffs lost their

Decline of the Crusading Spirit.

hold on human weakness; and neither the increase of exemptions* or indemnities, nor the multiplication of indulgences, availed to inflame the descendants of those spontaneous enthusiasts, who, in obedience to the preaching of the Hermit, had rushed forth to restore the honour of Christ, and avenge the wrongs of his worshippers.

As the causes, from which the crusading frenzy at first broke forth, were of long and regular growth, so likewise was the process of its extinction slow and gradual. Throughout the space of two hundred years, the original flame, though continually sinking, was not wholly lost;—it was still mingled, though in smaller proportions and fainter colours, with the various mass of new motives, which ineffectually endeavoured to supply its place, and which really derived their brightness from it. But when at length the sky cleared, and the last clouds had passed away, what were the traces of evil or of good which were left upon the face of the earth? What permanent effects were engraven upon the destinies of Europe by the violent hand which had so long directed them? From a system of military aggression, which had no foundation in reason, or even in those passions which are nearest to reason, few indeed were the fruits which could be expected for the benefit of society; and if any such did in effect proceed from the crusades, it was through circumstances wholly independent of their design. It appears to us, that these fortuitous advantages were both few in number and extremely partial. Perhaps it would be unreasonable to dispute that the decline of the baronial despotism, with the birth of municipal rights on the one hand, and the just extension of royal authority on the other, was accelerated by the violent alienations of property which the crusades occasioned; but those salutary changes would have been produced, and perhaps at no later period, by the same agency of wiser principles, advancing with the advancement of knowledge. We may indeed hail the accident which hastened (if it hastened) their appearance; but we should err were we to ascribe to it their existence. The commercial benefits which historians too generally connect with the expeditions to the East were principally confined to three cities of Italy—Venice, Genoa, and Pisa†; and if they were thence partially reflected to some other parts of the Peninsula, that was a poor compensation to the commonwealth of Europe for the violent extortions which exhausted its more powerful members—France, Germany, and England. Their treasures were drained, and the mighty sources of their national industry dried up, that the sails of two or three

* The Crusaders, besides their plenary indulgences, had several alluring temporal privileges, which are perhaps correctly reduced under the following heads:—1. They were exempted from prosecution for debt during the time of their service. 2. From paying interest for the money which they had borrowed for the outfit. 3. For a certain time, if not entirely, from the payment of taxes. 4. They might alienate their lands without the consent of the superior lord. 5. Their persons and effects were taken under the protection of St. Peter, and anathemas denounced against all who should molest them. 6. They enjoyed all the privileges of ecclesiastics; such as not being bound to plead in civil courts, &c.—(See Robertson's Proofs and Illustrations.) It remained, of course, very uncertain how far these privileges would be acknowledged by the secular authorities, and to what extent those civil courts would consent to forego their jurisdiction over so large a multitude; and thus the real value of these papal immunities depended on the Pope's influence and various other causes. The serfs who exchanged their agricultural service for that of the Cross appear by that act to have obtained their freedom: at least, that which was conferred by common military service would scarcely be withheld from the crusader.

† The results were probably unfavourable to Hamburg, Lübeck, and the other towns forming the Hanseatic League, by draining the capital southward. Besides the aristocratic military spirit, which was nourished by the Crusades, is essentially anti-commercial

small republics might overspread the Mediterranean, and receive the first fruits of the contributions so painfully levied for the chastisement of the Infidel.

The loss of Christian life occasioned by the crusades is fairly calculated at more than two millions. But if the mutual animosities of princes, or, what was even more destructive, the rage of private warfare, had been suspended during their continuance, some consolation for the sacrifice would have been offered to humanity by the repose and concord of the survivors. The fact, however, was otherwise: for a very few years after the departure of the first crusaders, the Truce of God was indeed observed; but immediately the tide of feudal barbarism returned into its former channel, and proved that the passion for international or domestic broils was neither consumed in foreign adventure, nor superseded by the thirst for it. It is even probable that the nature of such contests was still further embittered by the introduction of those habits of unrelenting ferocity, which are invariably generated by religious warfare.

It is, again, at least questionable, whether the arts of peace and civilization acknowledge any obligation to the influence of the Crusades. The barbarians gazed in ignorant admiration at the splendid magnificence of Constantinople—'How great is this city! how noble and beautiful! What a multitude of monasteries and palaces it contains of exquisite and wondrous fabric! How many structures are scattered even in the streets and alleys, which are marvellous to behold! It were tedious to recount what an abundance of all good things is found there, of gold and of silver, of every form of vestment, and of the *relics of the saints*.* The records of the time are filled with similar expressions of wild astonishment. But have we any proof that these enthusiasts profited by what they beheld?—that they imitated what they admired?—that they strove to transplant to their own soil that exotic genius and taste of which they felt the excellence? Or were they merely ruffled by a transient inconsequential emotion, unconnected with any principle of action, or intelligence of observation? . . . It is asserted, that if the Greeks were far superior to the western nations in the culture of humanity, the Saracens were scarcely less so; and the strangers had thus a double opportunity of discovering and correcting their deficiencies. But it is forgotten that the soldier of the Cross was no enlightened and leisurely traveller, searching to instruct himself and his generation; but a fierce, unlettered fanatic, proceeding on a purpose of bloodshed. In his prejudiced eyes, the civilization of the Greeks was inseparably associated with luxurious indolence and effeminate timidity; that of the Saracens with an impious faith and blaspheming tongue; and the disdain with which he regarded the one, and the detestation with which he approached the other, repelled him equally from the imitation of either. And if it be true, that, during the long period of two hundred years, some trifling advancement in the arts of civilization did in fact take place, it would still be difficult to specify a single invention as the indisputable effect of the Crusades. Chronological coincidences are sometimes mistaken for moral connexions; and the

* Fulcher, ap. Bongars. vol. i. p. 386. Fulcherius Carnotensis was chaplain to the Count of Chartres. The original passage is cited by Mills, Hist. Crus. chap. iii. It is certain that the collecting of relics was a very favourite occupation with the crusaders, who thus enriched with many remarkable treasures the sanctuaries of the West. But to this pursuit their curious industry seems to have been confined. We do not learn that they brought back any other contributions to the store of European piety, or any to the store of its learning. On the other hand, many monks took up arms, who would have been more innocently and more profitably employed at home.

changes which distinguish any age are thus too commonly ascribed to the passion or principle which may have predominated at the time. But in the present case, when we reflect that during the eleventh century—before the commencement of the crusades—the human mind had already revived and entered upon its certain career of improvement, we may indeed wonder that its progress was so slow, and its exertions so barren, during the two which followed; but it would be preposterous to attribute the few advantages, which may really have been introduced, to a cause which was in itself decidedly hostile to every moral melioration.

For, since knowledge is the only sure instrument for the elevation of man, can we imagine a condition of society more fatal to its progress than that which was regulated by the co-operation of superstitious zeal with military turbulence?—wherein two principles, separately so fruitful of mischief and misery, were leagued together against the virtue and happiness of mankind? What need we to pursue the inevitable consequences? War assumed a more frightful character by the impulse of fanaticism; and the ordinary barbarities of European strife were multiplied in the conflicts of the East. This necessarily grew out of the very nature of the contest. When the authority of Heaven is pleaded for the infliction of punishment, it creates an implacable and remorseless spirit; since it supersedes, by a stern necessity, all ordinary motives, and stifles the natural pleadings of humanity. The crusaders exclaimed, 'It is the will of God!' and in that fancied behest the fiercest brutalities, which the world had ever beheld, sought, not palliation, but honour, and the crown of eternal reward.

The spirit of religious persecution appears to have borrowed the peculiar * features, which afterwards distinguished it, from the practice, and even from the principles, of the crusades. To destroy the votaries of a different faith was esteemed an act of religion; and that, too, not so much because they were dangerous, as *because they differed*. The principle, which was originally intended against Mahometans only, took root generally. The rude understandings of a superstitious race were perplexed. One sort of difference might be as offensive to Heaven as another. The word heresy was not less diligently and deeply stigmatized in the tablets of the church, than infidelity. To the Pope, the infallible interpreter of the spiritual oracles, the former was at least as formidable and as hateful as the latter. And thus the weapon which had been applied with so much praise of piety to chastise the one, might be turned, with the same salutary efficacy, to the extirpation of the other. Through such an inference, which then appeared not unreasonable, urged by the authority of a powerful pontiff, the practice of religious massacre was introduced into the church of Christ; and when the ministers of bigotry had once revelled in blood, they were not soon or easily compelled to relinquish the cup. Among the many evil consequences of the crusades, we may account this, perhaps, as the worst,—that they put arms into the hands of intolerance, and finally kindled in the bosom of Europe the same fanatical passions, with which they had desolated the East.

* We more particularly mean the practice of assaulting whole sects and districts of heretics, as such, by authorized military force. The religious wars between the Catholics and the Arians were of a very different character from those between the Church and the Albigeois, &c.; and from the Arian Controversy to the time of the Crusades, persecution, in the West, had never the opportunity, whether it had the will or not, of destroying by wholesale. The existence of the heresy of the Vaudois during that period, though not improbable, is not historically certain.

It we are to believe the contemporary historians, the heroes of the cross were remarkable for their contempt of every moral principle; and the cities of Palestine were peculiarly polluted by the prevalence of vice. If those who resorted to the birth-place of their religion were not touched even on that holy spot by its plainest precepts—if the women were involved with the men, the priest with the warrior, in equal and indiscriminate profligacy—there can be no doubt in which direction the moral system of Europe was influenced by the crusades; nor can we suppose that the habits acquired in Syria were forgotten or abjured by the returning pilgrim.

Ecclesiastical writers are equally loud in their complaints, respecting the corruption sustained through the same means by the discipline of the church. The final cessation of canonical penance is ascribed to the introduction of the plenary indulgence. In uncivilized ages, the moderate use of the spiritual authority was unquestionably attended with advantage. The practice of prayer, of fasting, of alms-giving, under the superintendence of a pious confessor, was salutary to the offending individual and useful to society. It taught humiliation to the proud spirit; it taught the exercise of charity; and it may often have produced the genuine fruits of repentance. It is true that, in early times, some discretion had commonly been entrusted to the bishop, to mitigate and even, within certain limits, to commute the ordinary penalties; and it was not later than the eighth century, that even pilgrimages to certain specified places were substituted for the appointed penance. But before the times of the Crusades there was no mention of plenary indulgence. It had not hitherto been held out to the sinner that, by a *single act*, he might be discharged from all the temporal penalties imposed on him by the Divine Justice. This was an innovation exceeding the boldness of all former changes, and suited to the extraordinary occasion which called for it. But it is properly observed, that those who introduced it had forgotten the legitimate object of canonical penance; that it was enjoined to the sinner, not so much for his chastisement, as for the discipline and purification* of his soul. But what, after all, were the religious duties or merits, which took the place of the original system, and through which this full indulgence was acquired? To wear those arms, of which it had been penance indeed to be deprived; to turn them against a foreign, instead of a domestic foe; to engage in a mighty and soul-inspiring enterprise, instead of contesting the boundaries of a manor, or the fosse of a fortress. Such were the previous habits of the crusaders; and a system, which offered pardon on such easy terms, must have acted with many as a positive encouragement to sin.

As the process of canonical penance was commuted for the plenary indulgence, so was the indulgence itself directly and unreservedly† commuted for money. On the consequences of this second corruption we shall not further dwell, than to mention it among the causes which finally operated to quench the crusading ardour. So soon as absolutions were made matters of open traffic, the motive became too manifest; and thus

* Such was the original design of penance; but it is also true, that the idea of expiation, or an atonement for sin by suffering, very soon entered into the consideration, and very commonly took place of the first motive. That idea is at variance with the first principles of Christianity; and so far as it was prevalent, the penitential system was founded on a false principle, and its abolition can be no matter of regret to any true Christian.

† Penances, as we have mentioned, had been previously commuted, and commuted for money too, when they were commuted for alms: only, that which had hitherto been sparingly and decently and indirectly practised, grew into an avowed, authorised, habitual abuse.

at length the preachers of crusades attracted so few listeners, that it became necessary to promise temporary indulgences—of days or even years—to any who would consent to attend their sermons*.

The evil did not expire with its occasion; and after the Crusades were at an end, the popes discovered for it a new, an easier, and perhaps a more profitable object. By the institution of the Jubilee (in the year 1300), the place of pilgrimage was skilfully changed from Jerusalem to Rome; and the Tombs of the Apostles supplied, in the popular infatuation, the Cross and the Sepulchre of the Saviour. A consoling compensation was thus made both to the avarice of the Vatican and the superstition of the people; and the indulgence was not abandoned, nor its venality at all restrained, until the insulted sense and piety of mankind at length revolted against the enormous abuse.

If, then, we are obliged to admit that the effects of the Crusades were generally pernicious; if it is true that they caused an useless waste of human life, that they increased the ferocity of war, that they gave a deadlier form to religious persecution, that they depressed the level of morality, that they introduced into the discipline of the church its mortal corruption,—their good effects will be found insignificant in the comparison, even though we should account among them the aggrandizement of the sacred order; for one of their effects certainly was the immediate increase of the ecclesiastical revenues. The property of the crusaders was commonly placed, during the expedition, under the bishop's protection; and in case of his death, it often fell, without supposing any direct fraud, into the possession of the church. Again,—though there were wanting neither priests nor monks who assumed the cross in person, yet the number of those was by no means proportionate to the wealth and multitude of the holy community; so that they suffered less severely than any other class the immediate evils of the conflict. But the tax which was imposed on them by Innocent did in effect much more than counterbalance those temporary gains; and even in the most sordid calculation of the sacerdotal interests, we may safely pronounce that they did not permanently profit by that commotion, which overthrew for a season the general welfare of society.

NOTE (A) ON PAPAL DECRETALS.

IN the first ages of Christianity the letters written by the leading Fathers of the Church for the regulation of doctrine and discipline were called Decretals (*Epistolæ Decretales*). As the authority of the bishop of Rome gradually rose above that of other bishops and patriarchs, he also claimed an especial deference for his epistles; and in a synod held at Rome, in 494, under Pope Gelasius, the decretals of the Roman prelate were invested with the same authority as the canons of councils.

After the time of Charlemagne, the Popes, as they felt their growing power, proceeded not only to deny the necessity of any confirmation of their decretals, but to distinguish and exalt them, so as to supersede the canons of the church. As they increased in weight, they multiplied in number. Gratian, a native of Chiuri in Tuscany, a monk of St. Felix of Bologna, published his celebrated collection in 1151. Many had been previously put forth, but without obtaining any public authority. But that of Gratian was more favourably received, and was made the subject

* See Fleury's Discourse on the Crusades.

of the public lectures of the canonists. It was entitled the Book of Decrees, or simply *The Decretal*—*Decretum**, and was divided into three parts. The first of these, called *The Distinction*, comprised one hundred and one articles, regarding chiefly the different descriptions of laws, ecclesiastical and civil; the authority of the canons and decretals; the ceremonies of ordination; the duties of the clergy; the power of the pope. The second—*The Causes*—contained thirty-six sections, relating to various matters of church discipline and jurisdiction;—simony, appeals, evidence, elections, censures, testaments, sepultures, usury; of the rights of monks and abbots; of commendams, oaths, war, heresies, sorcery, &c. The third part—*On the Consecration*—treated of the consecration of churches; of the celebration of mass and the divine offices; of the eucharist and other sacraments; of fasts and festivals, and some other subjects. The work abounded in errors, not only as it attributed to the false decretals and other fabrications the authority of genuine compositions, but also as it falsified many of the passages cited from unsuspected monuments. Nevertheless, it was received without hesitation; and, after furnishing alone the materials of canonical learning to the schools of Europe, it became a sort of basis on which new and additional decrees and commentaries were fixed and long supported. Another collection was made by Bernardo Circa, Bishop of Faenza, in the year 1191. This work was intended as a supplement to the Decretals of Gratian, and was therefore called the Book of *Extravagants*, i. e. of matters not comprised in the Decretals. But as this was a private compilation, it obtained no force; and accordingly, about the year 1210, Innocent III. caused a more perfect collection to be made, and gave it the seal of public authority. This was called the *Roman Collection*.

As circumstances changed, and edicts increased in multitude, fresh compilations were thought necessary; and Gregory IX.† availed himself of so favourable an occasion for establishing and extending the monarchy of his see. In that, which was published under his auspices, and which affected to be modelled on the code of Justinian‡, such former constitutions, as seemed to him unsuitable to the character of his own times, were fearlessly cut away, and others inserted, on the plenitude of his own authority, which were more congenial to the age and more favourable to pontifical usurpation. As the compilation of Tribonianus had been divided into five books, so was that of Gregory. This work was immediately published throughout all the schools and universities of Europe; and as it was composed with great diligence and enforced by the highest authority, it was very generally and even eagerly received.

To this collection Boniface VIII. added, about the year 1299, an additional book, commonly known as the *Sixth* (*Liber Sextus*), and containing

* The author admitted the object and difficulty of his work, when he called it *Concordia Discordantium Canonum*.

† It is usual to reckon five different compilations of Decretals between Gratian and Gregory IX.—that of the Bishop of Faenza, three during the pontificate of Innocent III., and a fifth containing the Letters of Honorius III.—Dupin, *Bibl. Nouv.*, S. XII. ch. iii. and x. Raimond de Pennafort was the person to whom Gregory committed the labour of his compilation. The effect of these successive collections (as even the moderate Roman Catholic Historians avow) was to complete the overthrow of the ancient law, to establish the absolute and unbounded power of the pope, and to create an infinity of suits and processes, to be decided by the venal justice of the court of Rome. They were extensions of the principles of Gratian, as Gratian had enlarged upon those of the false Decretals, in at least two important points—in exempting the pope from the authority of the canons, and the clergy universally from every sort of lay jurisdiction. See Fleury's Seventh Discourse.

‡ The MS. of the Pandect was discovered among the ruins of Amalfi, in 1137.

all the constitutions posterior to the pontificate of Gregory IX. This too was universally acknowledged, excepting perhaps in France. It was further augmented, in the following age, by the *Clementines**; and they were succeeded by the *Extravagants*—a name adopted, probably, from the work of the Bishop of Faenza. These were the labours of the popes of Avignon; and as the Decretum was intended to correspond with the Pandects, and the Decretals with the Code, so the Extravagants had their model in the Novella of the imperial legislator. Under these heads the different branches of pontifical jurisprudence were, for a long period, comprised †, until they were further augmented by the much more modern addition of the Institutions.

NOTE (B) ON THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS.

The numerous public schools or academies which had previously been formed in various parts of Italy and France, at Salamanca, at Cologne, and elsewhere, assumed the form by which they were afterwards characterised during the thirteenth century. The most celebrated was that of Paris. It was adorned more than any other by the multitude, the rank, and the diligence of its students, and by the abilities and various acquirements of its professors; and since, while other academies confined their instructions to particular branches of science, that of Paris alone pretended to embrace the entire range, it was the first which took the title of University. In its origin ‡, in the century preceding, it had been composed of two classes—of artists, who gave instructions in the arts and philosophy; and of theologians, who delivered expositions and commentaries, some of them on the Holy Scriptures (they were afterwards called *Biblici*); others (denominated *Sententiarii*) on Peter the Lombard's Book of the Sentences. These two appear to have been the earliest *Faculties*; nor is mention made of any others§ in the Constitutions delivered in 1215 by the legate of Innocent III. But the other two—law and medicine—were founded immediately afterwards; and in a letter addressed by the university, in 1253, to all the prelates of the kingdom, the four faculties are boldly compared to the four rivers of the terrestrial paradise. Over each of these societies a doctor was chosen to preside, during a fixed period, by the suffrages of his colleagues, under the title of doyen, or dean.

In the first instance, the members of the academy were divided into two classes only—masters and scholars. There were no distinctions in grade or title; no previous ceremonies were necessary for advancement to any office. But the introduction of various degrees, to be conferred after certain fixed periods of study, followed very soon; and four were expressly specified—those of bachelor, licentiate, master, and doctor—in the reform by which Gregory IX. gave a permanent character to the university. While some of the Italian academies may have been more

* John XXII. published, in 1317, the Constitutions of his predecessor, Clement V. They were divided, as was the *Liber Sextus*, into five books, and recommended by a bull to the most eminent universities.

† In this short account we have chiefly followed Giannone, *Stor. di Nap.*, lib. xix. cap. v. s. 1. See also Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.*, *Siecle XII.* chap. xvii.

‡ We refer not to its antiquity,—since it boasts to have been founded by Charlemagne, and augmented by Lewis the Meek and Charles the Bald. Its completion it certainly owed to the kings of the third race, especially Lewis the Young and his son Philippe Auguste. It had some celebrity at the end of the tenth century; but before that epoch, the academy at Rheims seems to have been in greater repute.

§ Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.*, *Siec. XIII.*, chap. x. Mosheim, *Cent. XIII.* p. ii. chap. i.

eminent for a peculiar proficiency in the science of law or of medicine^{*}; the palm of theological superiority was conceded, without any dispute, to Paris. To afford still greater facilities and encouragement to this study, Robert de Sorbonne, a man abounding both in wealth and in piety, the chaplain and friend of St. Louis, founded, about the year 1250, that very renowned institution, which has associated his name, for so many centuries, with the theological labours, glories, and controversies of his countrymen.

These few sentences may be sufficient to call the reader's attention to an important and attractive subject, and even to render intelligible such passing mention, as will be made hereafter, of the university of Paris. But as the particulars of its origin, its construction, its growth, and its prosperity, do not strictly belong to ecclesiastical history, we must not permit them to usurp those scanty pages, which may be more appropriately, if not more instructively, occupied.

NOTE (C) ON CERTAIN THEOLOGICAL WRITERS.

The fathers of the early Church were cautious in provoking subtle speculations on the holy mysteries, and seldom engaged in that field of theology, unless to repel the invasion of some popular error. And even then they were usually contented to arm themselves with scripture and tradition as the principles of their defence, reserving the resources of reason for what they considered its legitimate object in theological controversies, the interpretation of the sacred writings. When philosophy was at length admitted to partake in these debates, the method first adopted, as most congenial to the sublime truths of religion, was that of Plato; and if they were sometimes exalted by this alliance into fantastical mysticism, they at least escaped the degrading torture of minute and pugnacious sophistry. But the rival system also found some early advocates †, though insufficient to give it general prevalence. Boethius applied the principles of Aristotle to the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, thus moving many abstruse and inexplicable questions; and John Damascenus afterwards published a methodical exposition of all the questions or difficulties of theology. In the West, in the ninth century, John Scotus Erigena fell into the same snare; but his method of subtilizing was not suited to the genius of his age; and during that which followed, every operation of the human mind was suspended.

But when reason again awoke, she was straightway delivered into the

* As was Bologna, for instance, for the former, and Salerno for the latter. Gratian published his Decretal at Bologna; and the stimulus thus given to the study of canon law continued long to produce its effect. The study of civil law in the same school is dated from about twenty years earlier—i. e. from the discovery of the Pandect. The medical precepts, which issued from Salerno, are said to have been derived from the books of the Arabians, or the schools of the Saracens in Spain and Africa.

† To such, and to the errors occasioned by them, is the allusion of Prudentius. Pref. secunda in Apotheosim.

Statum lacessunt omnipotentis Dei
Calumniosis litibus:
Fidem minutis dissecant ambagibus,
Ut quisque lingua nequior:
Solvunt ligantque questionum vincula
Per syllogismos plectiles.
Væ captiosis sycophantarum strophis,
Væ versipelli astutiæ!
Nodos tenaces recta rumpit regula,
Infesta dissertantibus.

Prudentius flourished at the end of the fourth century

fetters of Aristotle. Towards the middle of the eleventh century, his philosophy was taught, after the Arabian method, in the public schools; and though, in the first instance, it was confined to the illustration of profane subjects, yet as men became commonly imbued with its principles, and as the whole system, political and moral, in those days, was interwoven with religious, or at least with ecclesiastical, considerations, it was not long before the prevalent system passed obsequiously into the service of theology *. John the Sophist, Rocellinus, Berenger, Lanfranc, Anselm, introduced that method: it was improved by Abelard; it was rapidly propagated in all the schools of Europe †; and its immediate and necessary effect was to multiply, without any limit, the difficulties which it affected to resolve. The objects of the investigation were too immense for human comprehension, yet they were sought by the meanest exercise of human ratiocination. The end was unattainable; and, had it not been so, the means were those least likely to have attained it. Nevertheless, the disputants proceeded with eagerness and confidence; and thus it proved that, in this boundless field, the most different conclusions were reached by paths nearly similar; and that out of every question which it was proposed to resolve, a thousand other questions started forth, more abstruse, more absurd, more immeasurably remote from the precincts of reason and of sense ‡ than the original.

To impose some restraint on this great intellectual licentiousness,—to revive some respect for ancient authorities,—to erect some barrier, or at least some landmark, for *Peter the Lombard*. the guidance of his contemporaries, Peter the Lombard published, about the middle of the twelfth century, his celebrated ‘Book of the Sentences.’ Born in the country whence he derived his surname, and educated at Bologna, then more famous as a school for law than divinity, he proceeded to Paris for the prosecution of the latter study. He was recommended to the patronage of St. Bernard; and presently attained such eminence in academical erudition, that he was raised, in the

* ‘Fatendum simul est, (says Brucker, *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*), ex quo Philosophia Saracenica seculi xii Occidentis Christianis innotuit, plenis eos amplexibus inconditum philosophiæ genus recepit, et insanientium more in Dialecticam debacchatos, malum malo augendo ad Theologiam eam transtulisse.’ (See *Per. ii.*, par. ii., lib. ii., cap. ii. and iii.) That author shows, that, from the seventh until nearly the twelfth age, philosophy was confined to the possession of ecclesiastics, and to the limits of the Trivium and Quadrivium. The system which succeeded was called scholastic, as emerging from the schools of the monasteries. After the time of Gratian, the study of canon law was very commonly mixed up with it; and the combination of the three incongruities, Canon Law, Scholastic Philosophy, and Theology, formed what Brucker aptly denominates a *Triplex Monstrum*.

† Otho Frisingensis introduced the scholastic system into Germany. That prelate, the son of Leopold, marquis of Austria, and Agnes, daughter of Henry IV., was made bishop of Frisingen, in Bavaria, in the year 1138. He attended Conrad to the Holy Land in 1147, and died nine years afterwards. He wrote (in seven books) a Chronological History of the World, from the Creation to his own time, which is frequently cited by the ecclesiastical annalists.

‡ Among the multitude of these questions, there were some which ended, and after no very long investigation, in absolute infidelity. The Latin writers of the thirteenth age abound with complaints (exaggerated, no doubt, but not unfounded) of the progress of unchristian opinions, directly deduced from Aristotelian principles—that the soul perished with the body—that the world had had no beginning, and would have no end—that there was only one intellect among all the human race—that all things were subject to absolute fate or necessity—that the universe was not governed by Divine Providence, &c., &c. We should observe, that the Aristotelians declined what might have been the personal consequences of these opinions by a subtle distinction. These matters (they said) are philosophically true—but they are theologically false—*Vera sunt secundum Philosophiam, non secundum Fidem Catholicam*. See Mosheim, *Cent. XIII.* p. i. chap. ii., and p. ii. chap. v.

year 1150, to the See of Paris. The Book of the Sentences is a collection of passages of the Fathers, especially of St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustin, explaining and illustrating the principal questions, which then so violently agitated the scholastic doctors. The author was cautious in intermixing original observation with the venerable oracles of the early Church; and he trusted, by the ancient simplicity of his work, and his contempt of the fashionable subtleties, to restore some respect for the less vicious system of older times. The intrinsic merit of this production, the talents and extensive learning which it exhibited, recommended it to universal attention; and the 'Master of the Sentences' long retained an undisputed supremacy in the theological schools. But the effect of his work was not that which he had warmly and, perhaps, reasonably anticipated. The schoolmen made use of his text, principally that they might hang on it their futile disceptations and commentaries; and so fruitful was that elaborate book in matter for ingenious disputation, that Peter the Lombard, so far from having arrested the current, is usually ranked among the chiefs or fathers of the scholastic* theology.

If the dominion of Aristotle was for a moment suspended by the decree of the council of Paris†, (in 1209) which condemned *St. Thomas Aquinas*, it was effectually restored by the patronage of Frederic II. That emperor caused numerous translations to be made from his most celebrated compositions, and diffused through Italy, and especially at Bologna, the genius which had hitherto ruled with peculiar prevalence in France. At the same time, a new description of disputants had grown up, for whose character and offices the scholastic method was admirably calculated, and who carried it to its most pernicious perfection‡. The mendicants now gave laws to the academies of Europe;

* See Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth.*, Cent. XII. chap. xv. Néanmoins on peut le considérer comme le chef de tous les scholastiques; car quoiqu'il ait suivi dans son ouvrage une méthode bien différente des autres, quant à la manière de traiter les questions de Théologie; son livre leur a toutefois servi de fondement et de base, et ils n'ont fait en apparence que de commenter.

† The reason assigned for the condemnation of Aristotle on this celebrated occasion was, that his works had given occasion to the errors of Amalric, and might probably do so to many others. (See Brucker, *Loc. cit.*) And they did so; but the errors which scholastic subtlety raised, were as easily laid by a different formula of the same incantation—they appeared and disappeared, fleeting, impalpable, unsubstantial. The permanent heresies of the age stood on firmer ground. The grievances of the Waldenses and the Wicliffites were not the creations of sophistry; so neither could sophistry, though backed by persecution, silence the murmurs which they caused.

‡ We should here observe that the popes, however they profited by the influence of the mendicants, were by no means decided advocates of the scholastic theology. The celebrated Epistle of Gregory IX. to the doctors of Paris, contains (for instance) these words—*Mandamus et strictè præcipimus, quatenus, sine fermento mundanæ scientiæ, doceatis theologiam puritatem, non adulterantes verbum Dei philosophorum figmentis . . . sed contenti terminis a patribus institutis, mentes auditorum vestrorum fructu cœlestis eloquii saginetis, ut hauriant a fontibus Salvatoris.* The passage is cited by Mosheim. Cent. XIII. p. ii. chap. iii. Brucker (*Hist. Crit. Philosoph.* p. ii. Pars. ii. lib. ii. c. iii.) cites the following passage from a bull of the same pope published in 1231.—*'Magistri vero et Scholares Theologiæ . . . nec philosophos se ostentent, sed satagant fieri Theodidacti—nec loquantur in lingua populi linguam Hebræam cum asotica confundentes, sed de illis tantum in scholis questionibus disputent, quæ per libros theologicos et sanctorum patrum tractatus valeant terminari.'* But the system was extremely popular with the students; their ardour was aided by the edicts of Frederic II.; and the system of Aristotle, superior to all edicts, was destined to yield only to the predominance of another system, that of polite literature and natural reason. See Petrarch's complaints of the dishonour brought on theology, by 'the profane and loquacious dialecticians' of his day, *De Remed. Utriusq. Fortunæ*, and Tiraboschi, vol. v. p. i. lib. ii.

and the rules which they imposed were drawn from the code of Aristotle. At this time arose Thomas Aquinas, the 'angelic doctor,' the Coryphæus of the disciples of the Stagyræ. He was descended from an illustrious family and born in the neighbourhood of Naples, in the year 1224. He entered very young into the Dominican Order, and studied at Paris and at Cologne, under Albert the Great, a German scholastic, the dictator of his day*. St. Thomas (he was in due season canonized by John XXII.) died at the early age of fifty; but the writings which he has left behind him compose seventeen folio volumes. The most important among them are his Commentaries on Aristotle, and his Sum of Theology. But they likewise contain most voluminous observations on various books of the Old and New Testament, and investigations of many theological, metaphysical, and moral questions. They were studied in those days with insatiable avidity. They are now confined to the shelves of a few profound students, whence they will never again descend. It might seem harsh indeed to say of them, 'that they are of less account in the eyes of a sage, than the toil of a single husbandman, who multiplies the gifts of the Creator and supplies the food of his brethren†.' But there is room for doubt whether any important practical benefits were ever derived from them; whether the reflections which they awakened were generally profitable either to the present condition of man, or to his future prospects. And we certainly cannot question, that the spirit of contentious disceptation, which they nourished and propagated, was injurious to one of the best principles of religion, religious forbearance and universal charity‡.

Contemporary with St. Thomas Aquinas was another celebrated ornament of the church, St. Bonaventura. He was a native of Tuscany§, and entered in the year 1243 *St. Bonaventura*, into the Order of the Franciscans. He likewise completed his studies at Paris, and with such success, as to acquire the title of the Seraphic Doctor. In the year 1256 he was appointed General of his Order, and died at no very advanced age. His works are less voluminous than those of Aquinas, and bear the stamp of a very different character||. The tendency of his mind was rather towards the extreme of mysticism, than that of minute and frivolous disputation. It rose into the regions of spiritual aspiration; it courted no intellectual triumphs and

* This honour was, however, contested by our countryman, Alexander Hales, a Franciscan, who taught philosophy at Paris, and acquired the formidable title of 'The Irrefragable Doctor.' Another and more attractive appellation was 'The Fountain of Life.' He entered into the Franciscan Order in 1222, and died at Paris twenty-three years afterwards. His most important work was a Commentary on the 'Book of the Sentences,' composed by the order of Innocent IV.

† The words are Gibbon's—applied to a different subject.

‡ Fontenelle, we believe, (see Tiraboschi, Stor. Lett. Ital., vol. iv. p. i. lib. ii.) has somewhere said of St. Thomas Aquinas, 'that in another age and under other circumstances he would have been Des Cartes.' No one ever questioned his genius and immense erudition; or that he has intermixed some sensible remarks with the fashionable sophistry,—only we should not value him too highly for this. A great mind should oppose the evil principles of the time—at least it should lend no aid to them. Roger Bacon in the same age acted a nobler part.

§ The Italians are justly proud of the success of their countrymen in the schools of Paris. Besides the three eminent ecclesiastics mentioned in the text, they enumerate, among the Parisian Professors of the same age, John of Parma, a Franciscan; Egidio da Roma, an Augustinian; Agostino Trionfo of Ancona; and Jacopo da Viterbo. Through the following century the series continued, though with diminished brilliancy—and then it ceased.

|| Both these doctors are praised for professional disinterestedness. Bonaventura is related to have refused the archbishoprick of York; Aquinas that of Naples, as well as other dignities.

despised the abuse of reason. By this quality he has obtained, and in a great degree merited, the eulogies of Gerson*; who has pronounced (and the authority is respectable) that his works surpass in usefulness all those of his age, in regard to the spirit of the love of God and Christian devotion which speaks in him; that he is profound without being prolix, subtle without being curious, eloquent without vanity, ardent without inflation. There are many (says the critic) who teach the accuracy of doctrine; there are others who preach devotion; there are few who in their writings combine both these objects. But they are united by St. Bonaventura, whose devotion is instructive, and whose doctrine inspires devotion.

The celebrated controversy between the Realists and the Nominalists†, of which the origin was not long posterior to the general study of Aristotle, was continued with no great intermission till the days of Luther. The fourteenth century was particularly disturbed by its violence. Two of the leading champions of that age were John Duns Scotus‡, and his disciple William of Occam. The former had ventured boldly to impugn some of the positions and conclusions of St. Thomas Aquinas, and his opinions found many advocates. These formed the party of the Nominalists; and since, in the political disputes of the day, they favoured the cause of the emperor, they fell under the spiritual denunciations of the Vatican. Again, the Dominicans for the most part rallied round the banners of Aquinas and the pope, while the Franciscans commonly defended the tenets of Scotus, a member of their own order. Thus the controversy assumed a new name, as its character became more rancorous; and the ambitious polemics of that and of succeeding ages severally enlisted among the conflicting ranks of the *Thomists* and the *Scotists*. The principal points § of theological difference between these renowned adversaries, were 'the nature of the divine co-operation with the human will,' and 'the measure of divine grace' necessary for salvation. These were subjects which have employed the devout in every age, and provoked the perpetual exercise of reason. But the production, which was more effectual, perhaps, than any other in exalting the reputation of Scotus, was his demonstration of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. The Dominicans maintained that the holy Virgin was not exempt from the stain of original sin; the deeper devotion, or the bolder hypocrisy of the Franciscan supported the contrary opinion. That either party was right; it is beyond the capacity of man to ascertain; and it is clear, that both were equally absurd, in as far as both were equally positive. Yet, will it be believed that this inscrutable and most frivolous question formed an important subject of difference in the Roman Catholic church—a subject deemed not unworthy of the cognizance of popes and of councils—for the space of more than two hundred years?

* See Dupin. *Nouv. Biblioth. Cent.* XIII., chap. iv.

† Roscellinus, a native of Brittany, has the repute of having invented these opinions. He was opposed by Anselm, and compelled to abjure before a Council at Soissons, in 1092. He seems also to have incurred some danger from a popular tumult. He was exiled from France, and then passed a short time in England, where he gave great offence by censuring the concubinage of the clergy, attested by their numerous illegitimate children, and by calumniating (as is said) Archbishop Anselm. The writers of the *Hist. Litt. de la France* treat him throughout as a heretic—but none of his writings (if any ever existed) now remain.

‡ This—the subtle—doctor died in the year 1308. He was a native of Dunse in Scotland, and a Franciscan.

§ See Mosheim, *Cent. XIV.*, p. ii., chap. iii.

CONTENTS OF PART V.

CHAPTER XXII.—*Residence of the Popes at Avignon.*

(I.) History of the Popes—Clement V.—Council of Vienne—Condemnation of the Templars—John XXII.—his contest with Lewis of Bavaria—supposed heresy—Benedict XII.—Clement VI.—the Jubilee—Innocent VI.—Urban V.—goes to Rome but returns to Avignon—Gregory XI.—dies at Rome. (II.) General history of the Church—Decline of papal power—Rapacity and profligacy of the Court of Avignon—Attempts at Reform—Schism among the Franciscans—their disputes with John XXII. and other Popes—Change in the Imperial policy—The Beghards—The Lollhards—Heresy and fate of Dulcinus—The Flagellants—Conclusion.

CHAPTER XXIII.—*The Grand Schism of the Roman Catholic Church.*

Turbulent election of Urban VI.—his harshness—secession of the college to Anagni, and election of Clement VII.—his retreat to Avignon—division of Europe—Boniface IX. succeeds Urban—his extraordinary avarice—Pietro di Luna (Benedict XIII.) succeeds Clement—Attempts to heal the schism—Boniface succeeded by Innocent VII.—he by Angelo Corrarlo (Gregory XII.)—his reputation—Collusion of the two pretenders—Council of Pisa—their deposition and election of Alexander V., who is succeeded by John XXIII.—Council of Constance—escape and deposition of John—Abdication of Gregory—Conference of Perpignan and deposition of Luna—Election of Martin V.—Fate and character of Gregory—Benedict and John.

CHAPTER XXIV.—*Attempts of the Roman Catholic Church at Self-Reformation.*

Spirit manifested at the Council of Pisa—Testimonies of Churchmen against ecclesiastical corruption—extent of their complaints—Conduct of Alexander V.—Council of Constance—Gerson—The Committee of Reform—their labours—nature of the opposition—how their exertions are eluded—Election of Martin V.—who succeeds in evading all efficient Reform—Real objects of the Reformers—Remarks—Assembly of the Council of Basle—Eugenius IV.—Three objects of the Council—Cardinal Julian Cesarini—Struggle between the Council and the Pope—Substance of the enactments of the Council for Church Reform—New differences with Eugenius—Council of Ferrara and Florence—Cardinal of Arles—Deposition of Eugenius—Felix V.—Confirmation of the liberties of the Gallican Church—Conclusion.

CHAPTER XXV.—*History of the Hussites.*

Wiclif—his opinions—Introduced into Bohemia—John Huss—his proceedings—arrival at Constance—Safe-conduct of Sigismund—Various charges and processes of the Council against him—His firmness and execution—Jerome of Prague—his persecution—vacillation and final execution—Remarks—Insurrection of the Bohemians—their sanguinary and prolonged contest with the Church.

CHAPTER XXVI.—*History of the Greek Church after its separation from the Latin.*

The Paulicians—their history and opinions—Various mystics—Messalians, Quietists and others—Dispute on the God of Mahomet—Attempts to re-unite the two Churches—System of the Greek Church—distinguished from Latin—The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem—duration and consequences—Latin conquest of Constantinople—Establishment of a Roman Catholic Church in Greece—its endowments—Embassy to Nice for the re-union—its failure—other similar endeavours—faithless reconciliation at Lyons—attempts renewed in the fourteenth century—Negotiations with Eugenius IV.—Council of Ferrara—removed to Florence—its deliberations—Conditions and decree of union—Reception of the Greek deputies on their return to Constantinople—Violence of the Greeks—unabated—till the taking of Constantinople by Mahomet II.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XXVII.—*History of the Popes, from Nicholas V. to Leo X.*

Nicholas V.—his popular character—Callixtus III.—Æneas Sylvius or Pius II.—his election—exertions against the Turks—Paul II.—Sixtus IV.—his literary pretensions—Innocent VIII.—Rodrigo Borgia or Alexander VI.—consummation of papal iniquity—Pius III.—Jullus II.—his warlike talents, enterprize and success—Leo X.—The Lateran Council convoked by Julius and carried to its conclusion by Leo.

CHAPTER XXVIII. and Last.—*Preliminaries of the Reformation.*

(I.) A review of the decline of the papal system—in respect to its temporal power and pretensions—its internal constitution—its discipline, and moral instruction and practice—its spiritual innovations—Festivals, controversies, &c.—the mystics. (II.) On the endeavours of the Church to remove its own abuses—to what limits they were confined—On the exertions of Sectarians or Separatists—how early they began, and to what objects they tended—the treatment which they received from the Church—Some distinguished Reformers of the fifteenth century—A particular reference to the German Church—The conclusion of this history.

P A R T V.

CHAPTER XXII.

Residence at Avignon.

(I.) *History of the Popes.*—Clement V.—conditions imposed on him by Philip—he fixes his residence in France—Charges against the Templars—their seizure—Council General of Vienne—its three professed objects—Condemnation and punishment of the Templars—Remarks—Question on the orthodoxy of Boniface VIII.—Ecclesiastical abuses—Attempt at Reform—Elevation and character of John XXII.—his avarice—the apostolical chancery—his contest with Lewis of Bavaria—The Emperor advances to Rome—creates a rival Pope—fruitless issue of the struggle—appeals from Pope to a General Council—charges of heresy against John—his opinion respecting the intermediate State—commotion in the Church—his dying confession—Remarks—Benedict XII.—his virtues and endeavours to reform the Church—Clement VI.—Deputation from Rome—its three objects—the Jubilee—multitude of pilgrims—conduct of the Romans—Temporal prerogatives exercised by this Pope—Restrictions imposed in conclave on the future Pope—Innocent VI.—and instantly broken by him—his character and objects—disputes with the German Church—Urban V.—passed some time at Rome—but returned to Avignon—Gregory XI.—deputation from Rome—Catharine of Sienna—her pretensions—Embassy to Avignon—Interview with the Pope—he goes to Rome and dies there—Observations—(II.) *General history of the Church, its heresies, &c.*—(1.) Decline of the papal power—Intestine convulsions of the Ecclesiastical States—consequent deficiencies in papal revenues—means employed to replenish them—profligacy of the Court of Avignon—surpassing that of Rome—Temporal weakness and dependence of the Avignon Popes—Growing contempt for spiritual censures—Appeals to General Council—Disputes between the Pope and the Franciscans—Diffusion of knowledge among the laity.—(2.) Attempts at Reform feeble and ineffectual.—(3.) The character of the rigid Franciscans—Schism in that Order—The Spirituals and Brethren of the Community—Their treatment by Clement V.—By John XXII.—The Bull *Gloriosum Ecclesiam*—Some Spirituals burnt for heresy—their consequent increase—they unite with Lewis of Bavaria—The Pope aided by the Dominicans—Remarks—Charles IV.—Change in the Imperial policy—Triumph of the Pope and Inquisitors—Final division of the Franciscans—The Beghards—The Lollards—their origin and character—their alleged opinions and mysticism—Some contemporary institutions of the Church—Heresy and persecution of Dulcinus—The Flagellants—their origin—progress—practice and sufferings—Concluding observations.

SECTION I.

History of the Popes.

WHEN Philip undertook to raise the archbishop of Bourdeaux to the pontifical chair, six conditions are believed to have been imposed by the monarch, and accepted by the subject. Five of them stipulated for the entire forgiveness of all the insults which had been offered to Boniface, and the Roman See; for the restoration of the friends of Philip to communion and favour; for the power of exacting tenths for the five following years; for the condemnation of the memory of Boniface; for restitution of dignity to two degraded cardinals, and the creation of some others, friends of the king. The sixth was not then specified; the mention of it was reserved for a more convenient season*; and we may remark, that the others were obviously not suggested by any long-sighted policy aiming at the permanent humiliation of the Roman See, but rather by passion and temporary expediency. If we except the nomination of new cardinals, who would probably be French, there is not one among the conditions dictated, under the most favourable circumstances, by the great

* Bzovius, *Contin. of Baron. Annal. Ann. 1305, i. Fleury, liv. xc. s. xlix. Giannone, lib. xxii. cap. viii.* Historians are not agreed what the sixth condition was—some assert that it was to heap additional anathemas on Boniface, and burn his bones; others suppose it to have been fulfilled by the condemnation of the Templars, others by the transfer of the papal residence to France. The violence of Philip's character, and the mere temporary character of most of his other stipulations, make the first, perhaps, the most probable conjecture.

enemy of the See, which tended in effect to reduce it to dependence on his own throne, or even materially to weaken any one of the foundations of its power. Nor should this surprise us; since the violence which Philip exhibited throughout the contest, and the provocations which he received, make it probable, that his animosity was rather personal against Boniface, than political against the Church, or even Court, of Rome.

The first act of the Pope elect was to assemble his reluctant cardinals at Lyons, to officiate at his coronation*; and his reign, which began in 1305 and lasted for nine years, was entirely passed in the country where it commenced. Clement V. was alternately resident at Bourdeaux, Lyons, and Avignon; and he was the first among the spiritual descendants of St. Peter, who insulted the chair and tomb of the apostle by continual and voluntary absence: his example was followed by his successors until the year 1376. Thus for a period of about seventy years, the mighty pontifical authority, which was united by so many ties to the name of Rome, which in its nature was essentially Italian, and which claimed a boundless extent of despotism, was exercised by foreigners, in a foreign land, under the sceptre of a foreign prince. This humiliation, and, as it were, exile of the Holy See †, has been compared by Italian writers to the Babylonian captivity; and a notion, which may have originated in the accidental time of its duration, has been recommended by other points of similarity. French authors have regarded the secession to Avignon in a very different light—but we shall venture no remarks on the general character of this singular period, until we have described the leading occurrences which distinguished it.

Clement V. immediately fulfilled most of the stipulated conditions—he restored the partizans of the French king to their honours; he created several new cardinals, Gascons or Frenchmen; he revoked the various decrees made by Boniface VIII. against France, even to the Bull *Unam Sanctam*—at least he so qualified its operation, as not to extend it to a country which had merited that exception by its faithful attachment to the Roman See;—but when called upon to publish a formal condemnation of the memory of that pontiff, he receded from his engagement with the direct avowal, that such an act exceeded the limits of his authority, unless fortified by the sanction of a General Council.

Very soon afterwards, rumours were propagated respecting various abominations, both religious and moral, perpetrated by the Order of the Knights Templars—not in occasional licentiousness, but by the rule and practice of the society. Information of these offences was first communicated to Philip, afterwards to the pope; both parties attached, or affected to attach, infinite importance to it; and at length it was determined to refer that question also to a General Council. The Pope issued orders for such an assembly, and appointed Vienne, in Dauphiny, as the place of its meeting. In the meantime, Philip caused all the Templars in his dominions to be seized in one day (October 30, 1307); and Clement exerted himself with various, but very general, success to engage the other sovereigns of Europe to the same measure.

* King Philip officiated also, and condescended to lead the Pope's horse by the bridle, according to the ancient fashion of Imperial humiliation. Lyons boasted to be a free city, and the bishop had, in fact, gained the principal authority there, to the exclusion of that of the king of France.

† The Popes who reigned at Avignon, and who were all French, were—Clement V.—John XXII.—Benedict XII.—Clement VI.—Innocent VI.—Urban V.—Gregory XI.

On October 1, 1311, the Council assembled. Its professed objects were three:—1. To examine the charges against the Templars and secure the purity of the Catholic Faith. 2. To consult for the relief of the Holy Land. 3. To reform the *Council of Vienne*. manners of the clergy and the system of the Church*. The first of these terminated in the entire suppression of the Order; their property† was transferred to the Knights of the Hospital, who were considered a more faithful bulwark against the progress of the Infidel—(it was thus that the *second* purpose of the assembly was also supposed to be effected;) while their persons were consigned to the justice of provincial Councils, to be guided by the character, confession, or contumacy of the individual accused. By these means the greater part unquestionably escaped with their lives; but several were executed, and among these the Grand Master and the Commander of Normandy suffered under singular circumstances. They had confessed their guilt, and were consequently condemned by the bishops, to whom that office had been assigned by the Pope, to the mitigated punishment of perpetual imprisonment. On hearing this sentence, they retracted their confession and inflexibly protested their entire innocence. The cardinals remanded them for further trial on the morrow, but in the meantime, Philip, having learnt what had passed, and not brooking even so trifling a delay in the chastisement of an enemy, caused them to be burnt alive in a small island in the Seine, on the same evening. They endured their torments with great constancy; and the assembled crowd, as it believed their guilt, was astounded by their firmness.

On the reality of their guilt or innocence depends the character of Clement V.; for it is not probable that he was deceived in a matter so important, involving the *Probable Innocence of the Templars*. lives and property of so numerous and powerful a body, and to a certain extent the interests and honour of so many kings and nations. It is true, that it was by Philip that the first attack was made both upon their character and their persons; but the blast which he sounded was presently repeated by the Pope, and reiterated in every quarter of Europe. Again, the Templars were rich; and notwithstanding the nominal disposal of their property which was made at Vienne, there were few princes who entirely lost so favourable an opportunity for spoliation‡. It is admitted, indeed, that Philip continually disclaimed any avaricious motive for his aggression; and that he does not appear in fact to have turned his success to those ends; but he was irritated by their opposition to some former schemes, and against the Grand Master, in particular, he was known to entertain a personal and implacable animosity. . . . As to the proofs of their guilt—the confessions, which several are affirmed to have made, do not rest on any satisfactory evidence, though it seems probable, that some did really acknowledge all that was imputed to them. But of these, some may have been driven into weakness by

* Bzov. Contin. Baron. Ann., 311, s. i. Fleury, l. xci. sect. xxvi.

† Excepting that in Spain and Portugal, which was consecrated to the formation of a new order, with the prospect of a Moorish Crusade, under the especial superintendence of the pope. We find it, moreover, affirmed by Dupin, Nouv. Biblioth. Cent. XIV. chap. ii. that the publication of the Bull for the dissolution of the order was prevented in Germany, and that the Templars were there acquitted by a Provincial Council.

‡ As the princes enjoyed the rents of the landed estates, until the commissioners of the Knights of Rhodes had made out their claims, there arose great delays in resigning them. Philip himself retained a certain sum for the expenses of the prosecution; but not sufficient to justify any suspicion of rapacity.

torture or terror; while others, individually guilty, may have imputed to the society their private crimes. At any rate, their confessions are confronted by the firmness of many others, who repelled, under every risk and torture, the detestable accusations. Indeed many of the charges were of a nature so very monstrous *, so very remote from reason or nature, as almost to carry with them their own confutation—at least, the most explicit and unsuspecting evidence was necessary to establish their truth; and none such was offered.

Philip was more successful in his efforts to destroy an ancient and powerful Military Order, than to disgrace the memory of an insolent pontiff; and the Council, which suppressed the Templars with such little show of justice or humanity, contended with invincible eagerness for the reputation of Boniface. It was perseveringly attempted to attach the stain of heresy to his name; but though the king pursued this design with all the vehemence of malignity and revenge, the prelates assembled at Vienne, three hundred in number †, unanimously proclaimed his spotless orthodoxy—that he died, as he had lived, in the bosom of the Catholic faith. Disappointed in this favourite hope, the king was compelled to seek consolation in an edict published at the same time by the pope, which accorded a gracious pardon to the enemies and calumniators of Boniface.

For the third and worthiest object of the labour of the Council, an abundant harvest was provided by the multiplied abuses of the Church. It was complained that (in France at least) the Lord's day was more generally devoted to business or to pleasure than to divine worship; that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was frequently delegated to improper persons, and by them so scandalously perverted, that the censures of the Church had lost their power and their terrors; that many contemptible individuals, defective alike in learning and in morals, were admitted to the priesthood; that prebends and other dignities, being now in most cases filled by the pope, seldom by the bishop, were usually presented to strangers and even foreigners, men of dissolute morals, elevated by successful intrigues at the Court of Rome; and that thus the young and deserving aspirants for ecclesiastical promotion were frequently compelled to abandon the profession with disgust, and invariably became the bitterest and most dangerous enemies of the Church. Another abuse was, the immoderate indulgence of pluralities; many held at the same time four or five, some not fewer than a dozen benefices. Another evil mentioned, is the non-residence of many of the higher clergy, occasioned by the necessity of personally watching their interests at the Vatican. The sumptuous luxury in which they lived, and the negligence and indelicacy with which the divine services were performed, constituted another

* They are contained (see Bzovius, Ann. 1308, s. iii.) in six charges and fourteen questions—involving infidelity, blasphemy, and the most abominable impurities. That which the sufferers appear most generally to have confessed under the torture, was the public denial of Christ, as a condition of admission into the Order, attended with insults to the cross. We need scarcely refer the reader to the excellent remarks of Voltaire and Sismondi on this subject. The latter especially confirms his opinion, that the Templars were sacrificed, by contemporary authority and substantial reasons. Ital. Rep., ch. xix.

† Bzov. ad ann. 1312, i. A very tedious process against the orthodoxy of Boniface had been carried on in 1310, before the pope at Avignon, where Nogaret appeared as his principal accuser, and the agent of Philip. But Clement, unwilling on the one hand to offend the King, and not daring on the other to scandalize the Church, interposed so many delays, that Philip at length decided to await the decision of the General Council. See Fleury, l. xci. s. xliii.

charge against the beneficed clergy. The profligacy and simony, publicly practised at the Roman Court, swelled the long list of its acknowledged deformities*. On the dissolution of the Council, Clement published, in 1313, its canons, which were fifty-six in number. Most of these were, indeed, nominally directed to the reformation of the Church; the progress of heresy was vigorously opposed; and attempts were made to prevent or heal some divisions now beginning to spring up *within* the Church: subjects to which we shall presently recur. Some constitutions likewise regulated the relation of the bishops to the Monastic Orders; and others imposed greater decency on the *lower*† orders of the clergy; but the grand and vital disorders of the Church, those from which its real danger proceeded, and which were in fact the roots whence the others started into life and notice, these were left to flourish unviolated, and to spread more and more deeply into the bosom of the communion.

Clement V. died ‡ very soon afterwards, and his death was followed by an obstinate difference between the French and Italian cardinals respecting the *nation* of his *Election of John XXII.* successor. This was prolonged by the impatient interference of the populace §, excited, as it would seem, by some Gascon soldiers, who proposed to terminate the dispute by seizing the persons of the Italians. Accordingly, they set fire to the conclave; but the terrified cardinals escaped by another exit, and immediately dispersed and concealed themselves in various places of refuge. Such, indeed, was their panic, or at least their disinclination, that two years elapsed before they could be reassembled. At length, after a second deliberation, which lasted forty days, they elected James of Euse, a native of Cahors, cardinal bishop of Porto—such long delay and repeated consultation did it require, to add to the list of pontifical delinquents the name of John XXII. ! That Pope was of very low origin, the son of a shoemaker or a tapster ||; but he had natural talents and a taste for letters, which were early dis-

* The pope ordered all the bishops to bring with them to the Council expositions of all which seemed to demand correction. Two of these memoirs are still extant, and from them the abuses here briefly enumerated are taken. See Fleury, liv. cxi. s. li, lii, Semler, sec. xiv. cap. ii. 'Infinita fere sunt quæ reformari deberent; ignorantur quasi totaliter a Christianis articuli fidei et alia quæ ad religionem et salutem animarum pertinent . . . Monachi non vivunt in suo monasterio; sicut equus effrenis discurrunt, mercantur, et alia enormia faciunt, de quibus loqui verecundum est et turpe . . . prælati non possunt bonis personis hodie providere obstante multitudine Clericorum apud Curiam Romanam impetrantium, qui quidem nunquam Ecclesiam intrarunt . . . etiam pueri obtinent dignitates . . . Utinam *Cardinales*, qui sunt animalia pennata, plena oculis ante et retro, talia perspiciant . . . similes sibi similes eligunt . . . bene dico opus esse in *Capite* etiam et in membris reformatione.' The author of this bold appeal to the Head, which was not itself excepted from the general censure, is not known to posterity—the document is given by Raynaldus e Cod. Vaticano. Bzovius (ann. 1310, sec. vi.) enumerates, at great length, fifteen of the principal abuses with which the Church was charged on this occasion.

† The following is the Twenty-second Canon. 'Clerici conjugati carnificum seu macellariorum aut tabernariorum officium publicè et personaliter exercentes, vestes virgatas, partitas, neque statui suo conducentes, portantes severius puniantur.' See Bzovius, Contin. Ann. Baron., ann. 1313, sec. i.

‡ He died immensely rich, through the sale of benefices and other such traffic; and the moment that he was known to have expired, all the inmates of his palace are stated to have rushed with one consent to his treasury: not a single servant remained to watch the body of his master, inasmuch that the lights which were blazing round fell down and set fire to the bed. The flames were extinguished; but not till they had consumed half the body of the richest Pope who had yet governed the Church. Sismondi believes this anecdote.

§ The conclave was held at Carpentras, a place on the banks of the Rhone, not far from Avignon. It happened that the Court was assembled there when the Pope died; it therefore became the legal place for the new election.

|| Giovanni Villani, lib. ix. c. lxxix. Giannone, lib. xxii. cap. viii.

covered and encouraged, and his gradual rise to dignity in the Church was not disgraced by any notorious scandals*. But he had not long been in possession of the highest eminence, before he abandoned himself, without scruple or shame, to his predominant passion, avarice. He was not, indeed, exempt from the ambitious arrogance without the Church, and the vexatious intolerance within it, which seem at this time to have been communicated by the chair of St. Peter to its successive possessors—in a greater or less degree to each, according to his previous disposition to those qualities; but avarice was the vice by which John was individually and peculiarly characterized, and to which he gave, during his long pontificate, the most intemperate indulgence. Not contented with the usual methods of papal extortion, he displayed his ingenuity in the invention of others more effectual; he enlarged and extended the Rule of

The Apostolical Chancery. the Apostolical Chancery†; he imposed the payment of *annates* on Ecclesiastical Benefices; he multiplied the profitable abuse of dispensations; he increased in France the number of bishoprics; and commonly took advantage of the vacancy of a rich See, in order to make five or six translations, promoting each prelate to a dignity, somewhat wealthier than that, which he had before held: so that all were contented, (says Giannone‡) while all paid their fees. In a word, he considered kingdoms, cities, castles and territories to be the real patrimony of Christ, and held the true virtue of the Church to consist, not in contempt of the world and zeal for the faith and evangelical doctrine, but in oblations and tithes, and taxes, and collections, and purple, and gold and silver. Such is the language of the Italian historians, and if it be somewhat exaggerated by their general prejudices against the popes of Avignon, the immense § treasures which were unquestionably amassed

* The violent party-writers of the day, Franciscans and Ghibelines, who heaped every epithet of abuse upon the hostile name of John XXII., have been too hastily credited by some modern writers. Giovanni Villani admits that he was modest in his manner of life, sober, not luxurious, nor profuse in his personal expenditure. In the course of almost every night, he rose to say his office and to study; he celebrated mass almost every day; was easy of access and rapid in the performance of business. He was hasty in temper, of an informed and penetrating understanding, and magnanimous in affairs of importance. (See Fleury, l. xciv. s. xxxix.) These qualities and habits at least repel the charge of universal profligacy which has been brought against him. Nevertheless, it is the opinion of Sismondi (chap. xxix.) that his elevation was not less ascribable to his intrigues and effrontery than to his talents; and the public acts of his pontificate require no comment.

† He reduced the system of Apostolical taxation to a code of canon law. A deacon or sub-deacon might be absolved for murder, for about twenty crowns; a bishop for about three hundred livres: every crime had its price. See Denina, l4, vi.

‡ We might be disposed to receive this with some little suspicion, even from Giannone—since he was not only an Italian, but a decided anti-Gallican also—were not the facts directly derived from Giov. Villani.

§ Giov. Villani (lib. xi. cap. xx.) asserts (on the authority of his own brother, resident at Avignon, who received his information from the treasurers of the pope) that the treasure found on the death of John XXII. amounted to more than eighteen millions of florins in gold coin; while that in services of the table, crosses, crowns, mitres and other trinkets of gold and precious stones, rose to about seven millions more—total, twenty-five millions of golden florins. The greater part of this was amassed by John, and chiefly by his reservations of all the benefices of all the collegiate Churches of Christendom. His ordinary pretext was the liberation of the Holy Land.

The 'Storia or Nuova Cronica,' of Giovanni Villani, a citizen of Florence, begins at the earliest age and continues to the year of his death, 1348. It chiefly relates to the affairs of Florence, and is most instructive during the last century. His brother Matteo continued the History (with an addition by his own son Philip) as far as the year 1364.

by John, prepare us to believe much that is asserted respecting the methods of his exaction.

But the circumstance, by which this pontificate was most distinguished, and which for a moment raises us from the sordid details of fraud and extortion to the recollection of the loftier vices of the Gregories and the Innocents, was a contest which the Pope perseveringly maintained with the Emperor, Louis of Bavaria. Having entered at greater length, perhaps, than was necessary into the description of the two former conflicts between the empire and the holy see, and of that also between Philip and Boniface, we shall not pursue the particulars of this last and feeblest effort of declining papacy. The leading events are briefly these. The Electors assembled at Frankfort in 1314 were divided; and while some chose Louis for successor to the throne, others supported Frederic, Archduke of Austria. John * refused to confirm either of the Pretenders, and they continued to dispute the empire with the sword till the year 1323, when Frederic was defeated and taken prisoner. The Duke of Bavaria then took upon himself the imperial administration, without at all soliciting the sanction of the Pope. Thereupon the latter pronounced sentence against him, and prepared to support Leopold, the brother of Frederic. Louis boldly appealed to a General Council, and to a future and legitimate Pope, and he received in return an ineffectual sentence of excommunication and deposition. In the mean time, the war between the opposite parties had been maintained with great fury in Italy, and upon the whole to the advantage of the Guelphs, through the powerful aid of the King of Naples, still faithful to the Roman see. Consequently Louis was pressed to cross the Alps. He assembled a parliament at Milan, and assumed with great solemnity the iron crown. From Milan he advanced to Rome: the celerity of his march anticipated all opposition, and the ceremony of his coronation was there performed, with abundant pomp and acclamation, in January, 1328. Vigorous measures of hostility were at the same time adopted—a sentence of degradation against John XXII., and the appointment of a new and imperial Pope, who assumed the name of Nicholas V. But though an emperor might at this time be sufficiently powerful to repel with impunity the pontifical censures, his aggressive attempts were at least as futile as those of his adversary. Nicholas was rejected by the Catholic world; and, after two years of vain pretension, surrendered his title and his person to John. The Emperor had been previously compelled to retire from Rome. So that, after a fruitless contest of about seven years, the relative situation of the combatants was little altered; and the sentences

* In a bull published in 1317, John maintained that all imperial vicars lost their authority at the death of the Emperor, and that it devolved on the Pope. 'God himself,' he continued, 'has confided the empire of the earth, as well as that of heaven, to the sovereign pontiff. During the interregnum, all the rights of the empire devolve upon the church; and he who, without the permission of the apostolic see, continues to exercise the functions entrusted to him by the Emperor in his lifetime, offends against religion, plunges into crime, and attacks the divine Majesty itself.' See Sismondi, Rep. It., ch. xxix. This claim was pressed more than once by the Avignon Popes—the more eagerly because the legitimacy of 'the King of the Romans' was involved in that of the Emperor; and the Pope, who pretended to the prerogatives of the one, had a nearer interest in usurping the functions of the other.

† According to the account of Giovanni Villani (lib. x. cap. clxiv), he was delivered up by the Pisans, and sent to Avignon. He threw himself at the feet of the Pope, and prayed for mercy: e con bel sermone a autorità se confessò peccatore eretico col Bavero insieme, che fatto l'havea. It should be added, that John treated him extremely well, and that he died a natural death at Avignon three years afterwards.

of degradation and deposition, mutually reiterated, had no other effect than to prove to the world (though not so to the individuals engaged) that there was something in the claims of both parties extravagant and unfounded; and that the temporal authority on the one hand, and the spiritual on the other, though occasionally confounded by the abuse of both, were in fact, as they were in essence and origin, independent.

We observe that, in one respect at least, Louis deviated during this contest from the tactics of his two predecessors, and adopted those of the French King. The appeal from the authority of the Pope to that of a General Council was the severest wound which could be inflicted on papal arrogance. It was more than that,—since it led almost necessarily to the limitation of papal power. In an age of darkness, such an appeal might have been treated as a wanton, though bitter insult. But reason was at length awakened, and men were beginning to consider what ought to be, as well as what had been. The promulgation of a new and grand ecclesiastical principle, on the authority of a king and an emperor, would excite some consideration even among the most bigoted; and there would be few who did not begin to entertain a question respecting the spiritual omnipotence of the Pope.

Another measure was taken by the Emperor, also after the example of Philip, which tended more directly to the same end. In the Assembly held at Milan, at which several prelates attended, John XXII. was formally impeached on the charge of heresy. Sixteen

articles were specified, in which he erred against the constitutions of the General Councils; and he was pronounced to have virtually forfeited the pontifical dignity. It was a bold proceeding in Louis, on the judgment of a provincial meeting of his own partizans, to convict the Vicar of Christ of heretical depravity*. It was indeed to repel usurpation by usurpation, and to seize the spiritual sword in his strife to recover the material. The accusations were probably false, and certainly fruitless: they acquired no general credit at the time, nor have they adhered to the memory of the accused. Nevertheless, the mere assumption of papal fallibility in matters of faith by two powerful monarchs, and the vigour of the measures taken on that assumption, naturally confirmed the confidence of those whom reason had already led to the same conclusion.

But it also happened very strangely, that the same extraordinary charge was again incurred by John XXII. towards the end of his life, and with much greater appearance of reason. In some public discourses delivered in the course of the years 1331 and 1332, he had rashly declared his opinion, that the souls of the faithful, in their intermediate state, were indeed permitted to behold Christ as a man; but that the face of God, or the Divine Nature, was veiled from their sight until their reunion with the body at the last day†. The publication of this new doctrine produced a

* The Pope's disputes with the Spiritual Franciscans had raised a considerable party, even in the church, against him. Besides, all the theologians and sectarians, who were discontented with papal government, declared in favour of Louis. See the latter part of this chapter.

† Mosh., Cent. XIV., p. ii., ch. ii. 'The recompense of the saints, before the coming of Jesus Christ, was the bosom of Abraham; after his coming, his passion, and ascension, their recompense, till the day of judgment, is to be under the altar of God, that is, under the protection and consolation of the humanity of Jesus Christ. But after the judgment they shall be on the altar, that is, on the humanity of Jesus Christ, because then they shall behold not only his humanity, but also his divinity as it is in itself; for they shall see the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' These are the expressions of John, as given by Fleury, liv. xciv., sect. xxi.

deep sensation throughout Christendom. The immediate admission to the beatific Vision, a received and popular tenet, had been openly impugned by the highest spiritual authority : it became necessary either to resign the tenet or to condemn the Pope. Robert, King of Sicily, warmly exhorted John, whom he had attached by a long and useful alliance, to retract the offensive declaration. Philip VI. of France united with equal ardour in the same solicitation. The most learned Dominicans, together with all the doctors and divines of Paris, humbly urged the same entreaty. Laymen joined with churchmen, the friends of the Pontiff with his bitterest enemies, in rejecting and denouncing his error. The Pope was so far moved by such general and powerful interference, that he assembled, at the close of 1333, his Cardinals in public consistory ; and after having caused to be read in their presence all the passages of all writers who had treated the subject, (the labour of five days,) he protested that he had not designed to publish a decision contrary to Scripture or the orthodox faith ; and that, if he had so erred, he expressly revoked his error. This explanation may possibly have been considered somewhat equivocal ; at least it had not the effect of allaying the irritation which prevailed, and a second consistory was appointed for the same purpose in the December following. But on the evening preceding its assembly, John was seized by a mortal malady. Nevertheless, he summoned his Cardinals around him, and one of the last acts of his long life (he died at 90) was to read in their presence a bull, containing the following declaration : ‘ We confess and believe that souls purified and separated from their bodies are assembled in the kingdom of heaven in paradise, and behold God and the Divine Essence face to face clearly, in as far as is consistent with the condition of a separated soul. Anything which we may have preached, said, or written contrary to this opinion, we recall and cancel*.’ Still even the expiring confession of the Pontiff was not considered sufficiently explicit to satisfy the measure of orthodoxy ; and thus it came to pass that John XXII., after having ruled the apostolical church for above eighteen years, which he passed for the most part in amassing treasures†, in fomenting warlike tumults, and in chastising heretics, died himself under the general imputation of heresy. But the error of the pontifical delinquent was discreetly veiled by the church which it scandalized ; and when Benedict XII., his successor, hastened, in the year following, to restore the unanimity of the faithful respecting the Beatific Vision, he described it as a question which John was preparing to decide, when he was prevented by death‡.

The reasons which gave such popularity to the orthodox opinion on this subject, and excited such very general opposition to the other, were chiefly these :—If the Virgin, the Saints, and Martyrs, were not yet admitted to the Divine presence ; if they were only in distant and imperfect communication with the Deity, it was absurd to uphold their mediatorial office ; it was vain to supplicate the intercession of beings who had no access to the judgment-seat of Christ. Moreover, the mere insult thus offered to the dignity of the saints, and the disparagement of their long-acknowledged

* Bzov., Ann. 1334. i. Fleury, liv. xciv., sect. xxxviii.

† In the histories of his life we find many edicts directed against alchymists and the adulterers of coin,—proving at least how much of his attention was turned in that direction. He issued money from the pontifical mint, and counterfeited, with some loss of reputation, the florins of Florence. Giov. Villani, lib. ix., cap. clxx.

‡ In the bull *Benedictus Deus*, of which the substance is given by Fleury, liv. xciv., sect. xlv.

merits, were offences very sensibly felt and resented throughout the Catholic world. Another reason is likewise mentioned; and it may, in fact, have been the most powerful motive of dissatisfaction—if the dangerous opinion were once established, that the souls of the just, when liberated from purgatory, must still await the day of judgment for their recompense, the indulgences granted by the Church would be of no avail; and this (as the King of France very zealously proclaimed) would be effectually to vitiate the Catholic faith*!

Benedict XII. was born at Saverdun, in the county of Foix, and was the son of a baker. He possessed considerable theological learning, but such little talent for the management of an intriguing court, that he suspected and proclaimed his own incapacity† for the pontifical functions. But it proved otherwise; for he brought to that office a mind sensible of the corruption which surrounded him, and of the abuses which disfigured his Church, and he employed his useful administration in endeavours to remedy such of them as were placed within his reach. In the first exercise of his power, he dismissed to their benefices a vast number of courtly ecclesiastics, who preferred the splendour, and perhaps the vices, of Avignon to the discharge of their pastoral duties. A large body of cavaliers had been maintained by the pomp of his predecessor, with whose services Benedict immediately dispensed. He was sparing in the promotion of his own relatives, lest the king should make them the means of exerting influence over himself. He undertook the serious reform of the Monastic Orders—not confining his view to the less powerful communities, but purifying, with indiscriminate severity, the poor and the opulent, the Mendicants, Benedictines‡, and Augustinians; and the Order of Cîteaux, to which he had himself belonged, was the first object of his correction. He established numerous schools within the monasteries, and also compelled the young ecclesiastics to frequent the universities of Paris, Oxford§, Toulouse, and Montpellier. In the education of the clergy he saw

* See the end of the Tenth Book of Giovanni Villani. In the course of the controversy, excited solely by his own vanity, John professed the most impartial desire for truth; but it was observed that he showered his benefices most liberally upon those who supported the new opinion. Philip of France came boldly forward as the champion of orthodoxy, and the inviolable unity of the Church—'dicendo laicamente come fidel Christiano, che invano si pregherebbero i Santi, ò harebbesi speranza di salute per li loro meriti, se Nostra Donna Santa Maria, e Santo Giovanni, e Santo Piero, e Santo Paolo e li altri Santi non potessero vedere la Deitate al fino al di del Giudizio, e havere perfetta beatitudine in vita eterna; e che per quella opinione ogni indulgenza e perdonanza data per antico per Santa Chiesa, ò che si desse, era vana. Laqual cosa sarebbe grande errore e guastamento della Fede Catholica.'

† The cardinals, twenty-four in number, agreed with an unusual decision and unanimity, ascribed by some to divine inspiration, by others to a ridiculous mistake. Jacques Fournier (such was his name) being also a cardinal, was present at his own election, and when he heard the determination of his brethren, he reproached them with having elected an ass. He was certainly the least eminent member of the Sacred College; and to that circumstance, according to Giovanni Villani (lib. xi. cap. xxi.); he was indebted for his elevation. The cardinals, intending in the scrutiny to throw away their votes, fatally concurred in heaping them upon him—'ch'era tenuto il più menomo de' Cardinali.'

‡ Vit. Benedict. XII. ap. Baluzium. Benedict has been celebrated by the pen of Petrarch—

Te cui Telluris pariter Pelagique supremum
Contulit Imperium virtus meritumque pudorque.

Yet we observe (in Bzovius, ann. 1339, s. 1.) that on one occasion this virtuous pontiff reserved the appointment to all the prelacies of all the churches for the space of two years. Did he overlook in his reforming zeal the abuses by which he profited?

§ About twenty years later, an Archbishop of Armagh complained, that when he was

the only reasonable assurance for the stability of the Church. Lastly, he even displayed a willingness to restore the papal residence to Italy, if it should appear that his Italian subjects were desirous of his presence; but the Imperialists were at that moment so powerful, and the party-spirit so highly inflamed, that he received little encouragement in that design.

Clement VI., who succeeded Benedict, in the year 1342, did not imitate his virtues; but while, in his public department, he more nearly followed the footsteps of John XXII., he appears *Clement VI.* even to have outstripped that pontiff in the license of his private life. He was scarcely installed in his dignity, when he was addressed by a solemn deputation from the Roman people. It consisted of eighteen members*, one of whom was Petrarch; and it was charged with three petitions. The first was, that Clement would accept, personally and for his life only, the offices of Senator and Captain, together with the municipal charges; the second, that he would return to the possession of his proper and peculiar See; the third, that he would anticipate the Secular Jubilee ordained by Boniface VIII., and appoint its celebration in the *fiftieth* year. The Pope accepted for himself the proffered dignities, but without prejudice to the rights of the See; to the second, which was an important and wise request, he returned a friendly but decided refusal; but the third, which only tended to swell the profitable abuses of religion, he accorded without hesitation. The following is the substance of the bull which he issued (in 1343) for this purpose—'That the love of God has acquired for us an infinite treasure of merits, to which those of the Virgin and all the Saints are joined;—that he has left the dispensation of that treasure to St. Peter and his successors;—and consequently, that Pope Boniface VIII. had rightfully ordained, that all those who in the year 1300, and every following centurial year, should worship for a specified number of days in the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, at Rome, should obtain full indulgence for all their sins. But we have considered (he continues) that in the Mosaic Law, which Christ came spiritually to accomplish, the fiftieth year was the jubilee and remission of debts; and having also regard to the short duration of human life, we accord the same indulgence to all henceforward who shall visit the said churches, and that of St. John Lateran, on the fiftieth year. If Romans, they must attend for at least thirty following days; if foreigners, for at least fifteen.'

This proclamation was diligently published in every part of Christendom, and excited an incredible ardour for the Pilgrimage. During a winter of unusual *Celebration of the Jubilee.* inclemency, the roads were thronged with devout travellers, many of whom were compelled to pass the night without shelter or nourishment, in the fear of robbery, and the certainty of extortion. The streets of Rome presented for some months the spectacle of a vast moving multitude, continually flowing through them, and inexhaustibly renovated. The three appointed churches† were thronged

resident at Oxford, the University contained thirty thousand students; whereas, at the time when he wrote (in 1358) it contained only six thousand. The reason given for the decrease was, that the Mendicants, who occupied several of the chairs, had seduced so many of the young students into their Order, that parents were no longer willing to expose their children to that risk.

* The orator on this occasion was Colas di Rienzo, afterwards the Tribune of the Republic.

† 'In visiting the three churches (says Matt. Villani), including the distance from his lodging and the return to it, each pilgrim performed about eleven miles. The streets

with successive crowds, eager to throw off the burden of their sins, and also prepared to deposit some pious offering at every visit.

It is affirmed, that from Christmas till Easter, not fewer than a million, or even twelve hundred thousand strangers, were added to the population of the pontifical city; for as many as returned home after the completion of the prescribed ceremonies, were replaced by fresh bands of credulous sinners,—and those again by others, in such perennial abundance, that, even during the late and unwholesome season of the year, the number was never reduced below two hundred thousand. Every house was converted into an inn; and the object of every Roman was to extort the utmost possible profit from the occasion: neither shame nor fear restrained the eagerness of their avarice. While the neighbouring districts abounded with provisions, the citizens refused to admit a greater supply, than was scarcely sufficient to satisfy, at the highest expense, the simplest demands of the pilgrims; and thus those deluded devotees, after surmounting all other difficulties on their errand of superstition, were at length delivered up to be starved, as well as plundered, by the inhabitants of the Holy City. Such was the moral effect produced upon the Roman people by a festival, which was established for their pecuniary profit, and which disturbed the social system through every rank and profession, from one end of Christendom to the other*.

Clement renewed with Louis of Bavaria those vexatious disputes, which had been begun by John XXII., and conducted with so little advantage or honour to either party. Neither had the present difference, after many haughty words, any lasting result; though it seems probable, that the Pope might have succeeded in exciting a civil war in the dominions of his adversary, had not the latter escaped that calamity by death. The same pontiff defended his temporal prerogatives in a correspondence with Edward III. of England. At another time, publicly and in full consistory, he presented to Alphonso of Spain the sceptre of the Fortunate Islands. Nor was this right contested: the less so, perhaps, since St. Peter had claimed, in much earlier ages, the peculiar disposal of all insular domains. Clement also made an important acquisition to the patrimony of the Apostle by the purchase of the city of Avignon. The jurisdiction over that territory belonged to the Queen of Naples, as Countess of Provence; and for 80,000 golden florins she consented, in a moment of poverty, to part with the valuable possession. A splendid palace, which Benedict XII. had begun, was now completed and amplified by Clement; and the luxury of the cardinals followed, at no very humble distance, the example of the popes. These circumstances seemed to remove still farther the prospect of the Pope's restoration to his legitimate residence, and thus heightened

were perpetually full, so that every one was obliged, whether on foot or on horseback, to follow the crowd; and this made the progress very slow and disagreeable. The Holy Napkin of Christ was shown at St. Peter's every Sunday and solemn festival, for the consolation of the pilgrims (*Romei*). The press then was great and indiscreet; so it happened that sometimes two, sometimes four, or six, or even twelve, were found there crushed or trampled to death.

* This account is abbreviated from Matteo Villani, lib. i. cap. lvi. It is to be observed, that the Pope received a share of the oblations left by the pilgrims in the different churches. Clement VI. employed the fruits in an unsuccessful attempt to recover the property of his church from the nobles, who had usurped it.

† Urban II., in his Bull of 1091, presented the island of Corsica to the Bishop of Pisa; and we all recollect that our Henry II. received from Adrian IV. the donation of Ireland. En quoi (says Fleury) ce qui me paroît le plus remarquable n'est pas la prétention des Papes, mais la crédulité des Princes. But credulity, like many other weaknesses, is very commonly the offspring of interest.

the alarm, which some were beginning to entertain for the stability of the papal power.

Clement VI. died five years afterwards, in 1352—celebrated for the splendour of his establishment, for the sumptuousness of his table, and for his magnificent display of horses, squires, and pages; for the scandalous abuse of his patronage; for manners little becoming the sacred profession, and for the most unrestrained and unmuffled profligacy*.

During the vacancy of the see, the cardinals, while in conclave, passed certain resolutions for the limitation of the pontifical power and the extension of their own wealth and privileges; and the whole body bound themselves by oath to observe them. One of their

*Oath or Capitulation
taken in Conclave.*

number was then elected, Etienne Aubert, bishop of Ostia, who took the name of Innocent VI.; and almost his earliest act was to annul, as pope, what he had subscribed as cardinal. We must detest his private perjury; yet, as the Sacred College had no power of legislation, unless under the presidency of the pope, and as their office while in conclave was expressly restricted to the election of a pope, their constitutions could not legally be binding either on the church or on the future pontiff. The attempt of the cardinals is chiefly important, as it shows the power and the arrogance into which they had risen during the disorders of the Church; and the conduct of the pope is remarkable, as having furnished an example and a plea to several of his successors, who violated similar engagements in after times with the same perfidy. In every instance the future pope was a voluntary party to the compact deliberately made in conclave; in most cases he confirmed it after his election; he finally broke or evaded it in all.

Yet Innocent VI. was a man of simple manners and unblemished moral reputation; and having found the Church nearly in the same condition in which John XXII. bequeathed it to *Innocent VI.* Benedict, he imitated the latter in his judicious efforts to reform it. But, though he held the See for more than nine years, it seems doubtful whether his mild and perhaps feebly executed measures were effectual in removing any important abuse. At least, in the year 1358 we perceive him engaged in a dispute with his German clergy, not respecting the relaxation of their discipline, but upon a subject which was usually much dearer to the Popes of Avignon. Innocent demanded an extraordinary subsidy of the tenth of all ecclesiastical revenues, for the use of the apostolical chamber. The clergy of the three provinces of Treves, Mayence, and Cologne boldly refused payment; the spirit of interested opposition spread rapidly; and all orders of ecclesiastics throughout the whole empire united to resist the demand. The Pope yielded without struggle or remonstrance; but he immediately sought his consolation in the exercise of one of the grossest usurpations of his See.

* See Matt. Villani, lib. iii. cap. 43. He delighted to aggrandize his relatives, by conferring on them baronies in France, and raising them, however young and abandoned, to the highest dignities. 'At that time there was no regard to learning or virtue; it sufficed to satiate cupidity with the Red Hat—Huomo fù di convenevole scienza, molto cavallaresco, poco religioso. Delle femine essendo Archivescovo non si guardò, ma trapassò il modo de' secolari giovani Baroni: e nel Papato non sene seppe contenere ne occultare; ma alle sue camere andavano le grandi dame, come i prelati, e fra l'altre una Contessa di Torena fù tanto in suo piacere, che per lei faceva gran parte delle grazie sue. Quando era infermo le Dame il servivano, e governavano come congiunte parenti gli altri secolari. Il tesoro della Chiesa sribuì con larga mano. Delle Italiane discordie poco si curò, &c.' We observe, that some of the cardinals so appointed incurred the severe reproach of Innocent VI. by their undisguised debaucheries. Matt. Villan. lib. iv. cap. lxxvii.

He sent his messengers into every part of Germany, with orders to collect half the revenues of all vacant benefices, and to *reserve** them for the use of the Holy See. The Emperor (Charles IV.) approved the resistance of his bishops †; but on the one hand he denounced, in the strongest language, their pride, their avarice, and luxurious indulgences; while, on the other, he warmly demanded of the Nuncio from Avignon, wherefore the pontiff was so forward in taxing the property of the clergy, so remiss and languid in the restoration of their discipline? We should add, however, that Innocent, on his side, did not disregard that appeal, but turned himself to restrain the vices of the German prelates; while the Emperor exerted his authority to protect them from the spoliations to which they were perpetually liable from powerful laymen.

He was succeeded, in 1362, by Urban V., whose reign was distinguished by the first serious attempt to restore the pontifical court to *Urban V.* Rome. On the solicitation of his Italian subjects, urged by the eloquence of Petrarch ‡, and on an understanding of perfect friendship and mutual co-operation with the emperor, he abandoned the splendid security of Avignon, and departed, with his reluctant court, for Rome. On his way, a popular tumult at Viterbo dismayed and even endangered some of the cardinals; but no other impediment was offered; and in October, 1367, the pope once more occupied the half-dismantled palace of his predecessors. He divided a peaceful residence of about three years between Rome § and Montefiascone, where he passed the summer months; and his alliance with Charles IV. of

* Even the see of Avignon was left without a bishop during this and the preceding pontificate; it was reserved, and its revenues usurped by these popes at their own pleasure. Thus it would seem that the reforms of Innocent VI. were not more disinterested than those of Benedict. See *Vita Urbani V.* ap. Baluz. and Baluzius's Notes.

† In an assembly of the princes of the empire held on this subject in 1359, Conrad d'Alzeia, Count Palatine, who was charged with the defence of the clergy, addressed the meeting to this effect:—'The Romans have always considered Germany as a mine of gold, and have invented various methods to exhaust it. And what does the pope give in return, but epistles and speeches? Let him be master of all the benefices as to their collation, but let him leave the revenues to those who own them. We send abundance of money into Italy for divers manufactures, and to Avignon for our children who study there, and who there solicit, and let us not say purchase, benefices. No one is ignorant what sums are every year carried from Germany to the court of Rome, for the confirmation of prelates, the obtaining of benefices, the carrying on of suits and appeals before the Holy See—for dispensations, absolutions, indulgences, privileges and other favours. In all former days the archbishops used to confirm the elections of the bishops their suffragans; but in our time John XXII. violently usurped that right. And now another pope demands from his clergy a new and unheard-of subsidy, threatening his censures on all who shall refuse or oppose. Resist the beginning of this evil, and permit not the establishment of this degrading servitude.'—(Fleury, l. xcvi. s. xxxviii.) It was in the same year that the Emperor addressed to the Archbishop of Mayence the following complaints respecting the secular habits of his Clergy:—*De Christi Patrimonio ludos, hastiludia et torneamenta exercent; habitum militarem cum pretextis aureis et argenteis gestant, et calceos militares; comam et barbam nutriunt, et nihil, quod ad vitam et ordinem Ecclesiasticum spectat, ostendunt. Militaribus se duntaxat et secularibus actibus, vita et moribus, in suæ salutis dispendium et generale populi scandalum, immiscent.*—The passage is cited by Robertson, *Hist. Charles V.*, B. ii.

‡ 'Cogita tecum' (says Petrarch) 'in die ultimi iudicii an resurgere auias inter Avinionicos peccatores famosissimos nunc omnium qui sub celo sunt, an inter Petrum et Paulum, Stephanum et Laurentium, &c. &c.' The same argument, which is the concluding one, may probably have been adopted a few years afterwards by Catharine of Sienna. Petrarch became a very ardent eulogist of this Pope.

§ The Pope had the honour, during this period, of entertaining *both* the Emperors as his guests. Charles IV. visited him at Montefiascone in 1368; John Palæologus in the year following at Rome.

Germany, whatever may have been the dispositions of his subjects, guaranteed him against any political outrage. Nevertheless, in 1370, probably on the persuasion of the French cardinals *, he returned to Avignon, where he died immediately afterwards.

Again was a Frenchman, Gregory XI., elected to the chair, and he professed his inclination to repeat the experiment which had been made by his predecessor; but his resolution *Gregory XI.* was weakened and retarded by the intrigues of his countrymen. He listened, indeed, with attention to the prayer of a solemn deputation from the Roman people, in 1374; but he took no immediate steps to grant it. Two years afterwards he was still at Avignon, when he was again importuned on the same subject by a very different instrument of solicitation. There was one Catharine, the daughter of a citizen at Sienna, who had embraced the monastic life, and acquired extraordinary reputation for sanctity. In the rigour of her fastings and watchings, in the duties of seriousness and silence, in the fervency and continuance of her prayers, she far surpassed the merit of her holy sisters; and the austerities which she practised prepared people to believe the fables which she related †: for she professed to have derived her spiritual knowledge from no human instructor—from no humbler source, than the direct and personal communication of Christ himself. On one occasion especially she had been blessed by a vision, in which the Saviour appeared to her, *Catharine of Sienna*, accompanied by the Holy Mother and a numerous host of saints, and in their presence he solemnly espoused her, placing on her finger a golden ring, adorned with four pearls and a diamond. After the vision had vanished, the ring still remained, sensible and palpable to herself, though invisible to every other eye. Nor was this the only favour which she boasted to have received from the Lord Jesus: she had sucked the blood from the wound in His side; she had received His heart in exchange for her own; she bore on her body the marks of His wounds—though these too were imperceptible by any sight except her own ‡.

We do not relate such disgusting impiety, either because it was uncommon in those days, or because it was crowned by the solemn approbation of the Roman Church; for the wretched fanatic was canonized, and occupies no despicable station in the Holy Calendar: but it is a more extraordinary circumstance, awakening a deeper astonishment, that Catharine of Sienna was invited from her cell by the messengers of the Florentine people, and officially charged, by the compatriots of Dante and the contemporaries of Petrarch, with an important commission at the Court of Rome; the office of mitigating the papal displeasure, and reconciling the Church with the Republic was confided to her enthusiasm. She was admitted to an early audience. Her arguments, which she delivered in the vulgar Tuscan, were explained by the interpreter who attended her; and in conclusion, the Pope (assured, no doubt, of her devoted attachment to the Church) expressed his willingness to leave the

* Spondanus, Ann. 1370, s. iv. St. Brigida, who was at that time in Italy, is related to have assured the Pope, on the authority of an express revelation from the holy Virgin, that his return to Avignon would be immediately followed by his death—*abiit nihilo-minus*. Peter of Arragon likewise prophesied the Grand Schism from the same event.

† Fleury thinks that she believed them herself, and he may be right:—Une imagination vive, échauffée par les jeûnes et les veilles, pouvoit y avoir grande part: d'autant plus, qu'aucune occupation extérieure ne détournait ces pensées.—Liv. xcvi. s. xl.

‡ On the body of St. Francis the wounds were *visible*—a distinction conferred, as his disciples assert, on him alone. See Spondanus, ann. 1376, s. iv.

differences entirely to her decision *. But the embassy of Catharine was not confined to that object only; for, whether in obedience to the wish of the Florentines or to the suggestions of her own spirit, she urged at the same time the duties, which the pontiff owed to his Italian subjects, to the tombs of the Apostles, to the chair of his mighty predecessors; and her reasons are said to have influenced a mind already predisposed to listen to them.

Respecting the motives which created that disposition, it must be mentioned that the residence at Avignon was no longer recommended by that careless security which at first distinguished it from Rome. The open country had been invaded and the city menaced by one of those *Companies* of associated brigands who were the terror of the fourteenth century. During the pontificate of Innocent VI. the inhabitants and the court had been compelled to seek for safety sometimes in their arms†, sometimes in their riches; and though the danger might not be very pressing, yet being near at hand and fresh in recollection, it perhaps influenced beyond its importance the councils of Avignon. The Pope's resolution, however, still wavered; and was at length decided by a second embassy from Rome, which arrived about two months after the visit of St. Catharine. The envoys expressly assured him, that unless he returned to his See, the Romans would provide a Pope for themselves, who would reside among them; his cardinal legate at the city gave him the same assurance; and it afterwards appeared, that overtures had already been made to the Abbot of Monte Cassino to that effect. This was no moment for delay. Gregory immediately departed for his capital; and thence, whatever may have been his private intentions, he was not destined to return.

The place of the death of a pope was at that time of more lasting importance to the Church than his living residence, because the election of a successor could scarcely fail to be affected by the local circumstances under which he might be chosen. There could be no security for the continuance of the papal residence at Rome, until the crown should be again placed upon the head of an Italian. At Avignon, the French cardinals, who were more numerous, were certain to elect a French pope; but the accident which should oblige the Conclave to assemble in an Italian city, might probably lead, through the operation of external influences, to the choice of an Italian. That accident at length occurred, and its consequences will be pursued in the following chapter.

SECTION II.

In the meantime, the account which has been given of the pontiffs of Avignon is sufficient to throw some light on their individual merits, and, what is of much more consequence, on the general character and principles of their government. But a deeper consideration of this important period, suggests some reflections which it is proper to express; while there are some facts, less closely connected with papal biography, but not less strictly appertaining to the history of the Church, which have not been noticed, but which cannot wholly be overlooked. Accordingly, we shall first observe the decline which took place, during these seventy years, in

* Spondanus, ann. 1376, s. ii. It does not appear, by the way, that the Florentines were ready to extend the same deference to her judgment. See Sismondi, chap. xlix.

† Matt. Villan., lib. vii. cap. xcvi.

the pontifical power, and point out some of its most efficient causes. We shall then inquire, whether any attempts were made to obviate that decay, by measures of reform or renovation. The heresies which divided the Church, and the efforts which aimed to extinguish them, will be the last, and not the least instructive, subject of our examination.

I. The various and desultory warfare, alike savage in its circumstances and fruitless in its results, which was waged in Italy by the legates and mercenaries of the Pope*, in defence of the patrimony of St. Peter, is described by the civil historians of those times; nor shall we descend to recount the intrigues which were employed in the same contest, or the bulls which were so repeatedly and vainly *Decline of the* launched from Avignon. But the evil, which these *papal power.* measures were intended to repress, was deeply felt at the time, and was fatally pernicious in its consequences. We have observed, that, even during his residence at Rome and in the fullness of his power, the Pope was seldom in undisputed possession of the apostolical domains. But, in the season of his emigration, he could place little reliance on the friends whom he had deserted, while the licence of his enemies and depredators increased without restraint. Cities and populous districts were thus separated from the ecclesiastical states, and several among the Roman barons, who were his feudatories, usurped in perpetuity the lands of the Church. The deficiency thus occasioned in the pontifical treasury must needs be supplied from some new source; since the change in nation and residence had abated nothing of the pomp and prodigality of the Vicars of Christ. The funds to which they had chiefly recourse for this purpose were twofold. By the more general and easy sale of indulgences, they levied a productive tax upon the superstition of the people; at the same time they made a dangerous experiment on the submission of the clergy by various imposts on all ecclesiastical property†. The right of presentation to all vacant sees appears to have been first usurped by the Popes of Avignon. It was abused as soon as usurped; and the system of reservation deprived the diocese of its pastor, while it carried away its revenues into the apostolical chancery. At the same time the frequent contribution of tenths and first-fruits, raised under crusading or other pretences, gave deeper offence to the sacred order, as it touched their interests more directly and personally. It was vain to imagine, that the monstrous

* It is truly remarked by Sismondi, that the Avignon Popes prosecuted these wars with greater ardour, than they would have done, had they been resident in Italy, or than they could, had they drawn their resources only from Italy. They suffered no personal dangers, they saw nothing of the evils which they inflicted, and they derived their supplies from the contributions of the whole church. The complaints which the Florentines had against the papal *Gubernatores* are enumerated with great warmth by Leonardus Aretinus. Hist. Florent., lib. viii., 181, 2.

† The following are mentioned as the sources of the papal exactions from England during the fourteenth century:—(1.) Peter's Pence; for the supposed support of the English pilgrims at Rome: it scarcely exceeded 200*l.* a-year. (2.) King John's census, of 1000 marks. This was tolerably well paid; till the time of Urban V., in 1366, when king, clergy, lords, and commons, proclaimed the payment illegal, and it ceased. (3.) The payment of First-fruits. The origin of this is referred to the presents which, in very early ages, a bishop at his consecration, or a priest at his ordination, paid to the officiating prelate. It was abolished by Gregory the Great, but soon grew up again, and insensibly came to be rated at a year's income. Presently, when prelates obtained their sees by provisions, those first-fruits flowed into the apostolical treasury. Those of smaller benefices were at first granted, seemingly in the thirteenth century, to bishops and archbishops. At length, Clement V. reserved for his own use all first-fruits, and John XXII. imitated his example. See Lingard's History.

system of papacy could long subsist, unless supported by the attachment and almost unanimity of the ecclesiastical body; nor could such concord easily take place, unless the Pope could contrive to identify his interests with those of the clergy, or at least to persuade the clergy of such identity. But from the hour that his exigencies could only be supplied at their expense,—that his dignity, his luxuries, his very vices, tended to impoverish, and no longer to enrich, them; from that hour a very powerful, though very sordid instrument of connexion began to give way, and the discontent, which might originate in pure selfishness, found abundant fuel, as well as ample justification, in the manifold abuses which disgraced the papal court.

Still there had been less danger from this disaffection, had the Popes pressed their impolitic exactions with any show of moderation; had they been contented to satisfy their necessities, or even to maintain with judicious liberality the ceremony and pomp of office.

*Rapacity of the Popes,
and profligacy
of the Court.*

But so far were they removed from any such discretion, that it rather seemed their object so to reign, as to unite prodigality with avarice—to spend profusely and hoard insatiably. It was this spirit of rapacity which presided over the councils of Avignon. The lofty pretensions which animated and even dignified the Pontiffs of former days, were degraded into mere lifeless instruments to the lowest worldly purposes. We seek not now for the deep religious enthusiasm of the earliest Popes, for that had long been extinguished; but the exalted and magnanimous audacity of the Gregories and even the Innocents,—the settled ecclesiastical fanaticism (if we may use the expression), which so long dazzled the reason of man,—these too had at length given place to baser principles and passions. The cloud of mystery, which had so long hung over the chair of St. Peter, filling the nations with awe for the invisible power and majesty residing there, was at length dispersed and broken away, and in its place was discovered the nakedness of human turpitude. The charm of opinion began gradually to dissolve; and whatsoever prejudices many still retained in favour of the papal government, they were weakened by the sordid motives which now directed it; and an unpopular vice became still more detested, when it was found engrafted upon the ecclesiastical character.

Another cause, which materially assisted, during this period, in hastening the decline of papacy, was the shameless profligacy of the court of Avignon. There is no dispute as to this fact; and even moderate writers have strained their language, in order to present a just picture of that deformity. We refer not to the partial philippics of Petrarch; nor to the unholy name of Babylon, which may first have been affixed to the city of the Popes, from a similarity in crime. But when Denina assures us, that the licentiousness of the clergy became excessive and universal, from the time that the scandals of Avignon had removed all restraint and shame; and when Sismondi* declares, that that people and that court made themselves manners out of the vices of all other nations, those historians do not exceed the testimony of contemporary authorities. The causes and sources of this pestilence are disputed: it is ascribed by the French writers to the importation of Transalpine fashions and morals into their less corrupt climate; while the Italians retort the charge of greater impurity, and enlarge, perhaps with more justice, on the temptations

* Denina, Delle Rivoluz. d'Italia, lib. xv., cap. vi. Sismondi, Rep. Ital., chap. xlviii. See Baluz., Pref. in Vitas Pontif. Avenionensium,

which may ensnare a bishop who resides at a distance from his diocese, who is surrounded by a court of prelates also non-resident, without any spiritual care or any restraint from the observation of the people. Howbeit, this argument would have had more weight, had the court of Rome been less polluted: but whatever may have been the comparative delinquencies of Rome and Avignon, it is at least certain, that the latter were more indecent and more notorious; that offences, which (if they were really practised) had been heretofore veiled or only partially known, were now exposed and stigmatized universally; and that the only alternative thenceforward remaining to the pontifical government was to correct those flagrant abuses, or by their means to fall*.

The publication of the celebrated bull, called *Unam Sanctam*, in which Boniface VIII. asserted the extreme pretensions of his see to both descriptions of supremacy, may be viewed, perhaps, as the great Crisis in papal history. As far as that moment, nothing had been ceded in the pontifical claims, and nothing abated in the arrogance with which they were pressed. It may be, that their foundations had been silently crumbling beneath them, but their actual instability was still concealed by outward show and magnificent pretension. But from this point the descent was perceptible, and it soon became very rapid; and Philip, having penetrated the secret of the real weakness of the see, effectually brought about its humiliation. His attack on the personal safety of Boniface, though in a great measure defeated by the undaunted constancy of that Pontiff, disclosed to the whole world the domestic insecurity of the Bishop of Rome.

Still it must be acknowledged that a Pope, as long as the seat of his government was his own capital, could not ever be the mere dependent of any sovereign; and this is the argument by which Roman Catholic writers most plausibly defend the temporal power of the Chief of their church. But no sooner had he crossed the Alps and transferred his court to France, than he descended to the condition of a subordinate prince. It was in vain, that the formalities of respect, and even the show of equality, were observed: the influence of the King of France predominated in the councils of Avignon; and the sense and the notoriety of temporal dependence discouraged the ghostly pretensions of the Pope, and blunted the edge of his weapons. For this, among other reasons, we are not surprised to observe, that the ecclesiastical censures lost much of their efficacy during this age; that they were received in various countries with various degrees of indifference, but that this indifference was everywhere increasing. Italy herself was the most conspicuous for the general neglect with which she treated them; and Italy, in her spiritual rebellion, did no more than imitate the pre-eminent obduracy of Rome. For Rome was irritated by the absence of her prelate; and her habitual contumacy and lawlessness found great pretence and some justification, when she was deprived even of the ordinary advantages of an episcopal residence.

Another severe, and even incurable, wound, was inflicted on papal despotism by the threat of appeal to a General Council, which was first urged by Philip, and eagerly repeated by Louis of Bavaria. That there was a power superior to the Pope within the church itself, was a principle

* During the pontificate of John XXII., complaints against the clergy began to break out very commonly in France, occasioned by the excess to which they carried their jurisdiction, as well as other offences. But Philip the Regent protected them,—‘*Jura ecclesiarum auxerim potius quam imminuta velim.*’ It is remarkable, that it was to this declaration that the kings of France are indebted for the title of *Catholic*,—so, at least, says Bzovius, Ann. 1329, s. xxiii.

which was sure to find many advocates even in the ecclesiastical body. Once broached, and on such high authority, it was commonly discussed, and by discussion gained ground; and though the progress of reason against established prejudice is usually very slow, the minds of many were prepared for this innovation during the first half of the fourteenth century; but it was not carried into full effect till somewhat later.

Of the dissensions which divided the church during this period, and which we shall presently notice, none probably occasioned so great scandal at the time, as the disputes carried on by the more rigid Franciscans against the Pope himself. Between the higher ranks of the secular clergy and their acknowledged head, we have observed differences not uncommon respecting their authority, their revenues, or the removal of their corruptions. But the regular orders had hitherto observed the strictest allegiance to a president, whose interests were inseparably connected with their own; and this was the first occasion on which the pontifical court was disturbed by the sound of monastic insubordination. There was danger in an example, which might be followed by any discontented branch of the priesthood; but the consequence, which really and immediately followed it, was to open the eyes of the laity to the deformities of the system, and to rouse them against those abuses, which ecclesiastics themselves no longer conspired to defend.

But another, and a still more certain instrument for the subversion of papacy had been now for some time in operation, and it acquired additional power during the fourteenth century; an instrument, independent of the accidents of papal 'captivity' or ecclesiastical discord, and one which, however aided by such circumstances, would surely have accomplished its task without them. Human reason had at length been awakened from its long lethargy; and though its first flights were wild and irregular, it was beginning to extend its influence and to know its authority. The means of education were multiplied, its character was varied and exalted; and what was most important to all purposes of general improvement, its advantages were no longer confined to a privileged body, but were diffused through every condition of society. The subjects, indeed, which still engrossed the greater portion of the learning of those days, were generally connected with theology, or with the constitution and discipline of the church. Still it was not to churchmen alone, that such discussions were confined. Those who profited by the ecclesiastical system were no longer the only persons qualified to argue respecting it. No sooner were the gates opened, than the laity rushed into that province with great eagerness; and the seeds of the Reformation were already scattered, though it was uncertain when they would break forth, or what fruits they would bear in their maturity.

II. The abuses which gave most offence at the commencement of this period, so as to excite the indignation of the

Attempts at Reformation.

better portion of the clergy, and even to claim the attention of the hierarchy, have been enumerated in a former page, as they were presented to the Council of Vienne. They were not corrected on that occasion, and they increased in consequence.

We must not, however, suppose, that no regulations were enacted under the Avignon Popes for the amendment of the ecclesiastical system; they were very numerous*; but the misfortune was, that they were generally

* A number of the Councils assembled for this purpose, and the principal canons enacted by them are mentioned by Semler, sec. xiv, cap. ii. The following are specimens:—*Concil. Colonienſe*, ann. 1313. *Ne clericis publica pœnitentia imponatur*, cum

misdirected. They descended to insignificant particulars, or were fabricated by one portion of the clergy against another, or by the orthodox against the heretics; or they related to the imposts of the Pope and the means of evading them; they never reached those grand deformities which endangered the church, through the just offence which they gave to the laity. It is true that some papal constitutions were published both against the non-residence of the clergy and the holding of pluralities. But the first could not be consistently enforced by a prelate who had never visited his own see; and the Popes, though they held decisive language*, were manifestly insincere in the second. Or, if we are to admit that one or two among them were really earnest in their wishes and endeavours, they were at least prevented from taking measures to effectuate them by the fear of offending the most powerful, though perhaps the least deserving, part of the sacred body.

III. When Francis of Umbria first established his rigid Order, his rule was celebrated by the applause of successive popes. The impious fables which he propagated, *Divisions and Heresies*, respecting the miraculous impression of the Saviour's wounds on his body, and other such matters, were countenanced and dignified by the authority of the Church; he was adopted with eagerness into the family of the Saints†; and the extreme austerity of the institution seemed in some fashion to be sanctified by the superstitious reverence, thus studiously thrown around the name of the Founder. We are not, then, to be astonished when we observe, that several among his followers adhered to the very letter of his instructions with unprecedented pertinacity, and scorned the vulgar temptations to soften their severity. The example of relaxation set to them by almost every other Order, the desertion of the more numerous part even of their own brethren, the moderate indulgence enjoined by the Pope himself, were insufficient to seduce those honest fanatics from strict obedience to their law, or to abate the vivid faith which they placed in their master. For indeed it was

alii in albis procedunt, alii in nigris cappis, in facie laicorum. Ne fiant imprecationes contra aliquas personas. Concil. *Trevirensis*, *cj. ann.* Contra gerentes cucuteras, seu cucusas, mitras, virgatas, scacatas vestes. Contra convivia in exequiis. . . Ut ante vel post vel super altare sit imago, sculptura, pictura, in cujus Sancti meritum constructum sit. . . Si infans caput ex utero emisit a muliere baptizetur; si solum caput vel pars corporis major appareat nec discerni potest sexus: dicat, *Creatura Dei*, ego, &c. &c., et erit baptizatus.

* John XXII. in 1317 put forth a constitution against all ambitious and avaricious clergymen, complaining of their non-residence, neglect of hospitality, the ruin of their churches, &c. And we observe, at the same time, that he deposed a bishop; not, however, on any of these grave charges, but for the offence of contumacy. (*Bæov*, ann. 1317, s. xiii.) The same pontiff also published an edict against pluralities, beginning '*Eecrabilis quorundam*,' &c., and continued in a strain of emphatic abuse. (See *Vit.*, (3tia.) *Joh. XXII. ap. Baluzium*.) Similar laws were launched, with the same inefficiency, by Benedict XII., and afterwards by Innocent VI. A curious story is told to prove the zeal of this last. Innocent, before his elevation, had a favourite chaplain, on whom had been conferred seven benefices. As soon as he became Pope, the chaplain again presented himself, bringing with him a little godson, for whom he wished also to procure a benefice. But the Pope, like a just man, answered him: 'You have seven good benefices; resign the best of them to that boy.' On which, when Innocent saw that the petitioner was discontented, he again said, 'You have still six benefices, and fewer would suffice for your necessities: choose, then, for yourself the three best of them, and resign the others, that I may bestow them, for the honour of God, on three poor clergymen.' The Pope was highly applauded for that act, as having therein followed the path of spiritual, rather than carnal affection. See *Vita* (4ta) *Innocent. VI.*, apud *Baluzium*.

† Both Francis and Dominic were canonized by the same pope, Gregory IX. (about 1235); so likewise was Anthony of Padua, and other less considerable personages.

to faith that their feelings amounted, when they maintained that St. Francis was a second Christ—nothing inferior or dissimilar to the first; and that the institution which he left behind him was the true gospel of salvation.

Entire and absolute poverty, the complete renunciation of all property, whether common or personal, was the fundamental principle of the society, the only principle of Christian obedience—the only rule of evangelical perfection. In defence of that position, it became them at the same time to profess and argue, that the practice of Christ and his Apostles had been rigidly formed upon the same rule; and this became accordingly the question in dispute with their theological adversaries. Those adversaries, as we may well suppose, were neither few nor of humble rank. A courtly and luxurious hierarchy were scandalized by that unqualified assertion of the necessity of poverty; and Christ's imperious vicegerent upon earth was shocked by so homely a picture of the humility of his heavenly Lord.

Some unsuccessful endeavours were made in the preceding century to bring the Fratricelli, or Minorites (so they were denominated) to a more reasonable view of the gospel institution, and of the *spirit* of their own rule: but it does not appear that any personal outrage was offered them until the year 1306; and even then it proceeded, as was naturally to be expected, from the more worldly members of their own fraternity. From Italy, many then fled into Provence, and were scattered over the south of France; and at this time they are represented to have united with the Spirituals, and the Beghards and Beguines. The name *Spiritual* is said to have been first assumed by the followers of a schismatic of that age, named Pierre d'Olive; the others were the Tertiarii, or third order of Franciscans. All were equally opposed to the existing system of papal government. As their principles were henceforward identified, so also was their history; and the term *spiritual* is that by which the observers of the rule of absolute poverty were commonly distinguished from their less austere *Brethren of the Community*.

Clement V. interposed his mediation between these contentious mendicants; and at the Council of Vienna he issued the Bull *Exivi de Paradiso*, with the design of bringing them to concord by mutual concession. He permitted to the Spirituals the enjoyment of the most abject poverty; while at the same time, to such Franciscans as resided in barren countries, where the resources of mendicity were precarious, he allowed the use of granaries and store-houses, as places of deposit for their common alms. Nevertheless, though all acts of violence were for the moment suspended, the division of the Order continued as before, and the mutual animosity was in no degree abated; and a distinction in dress at this time introduced by the Minorites, who adopted a meaner and coarser habit, contributed no little to inflame the controversy.

Matters stood thus, when John XXII. was raised to the pontificate; and since the moderation of his predecessors had not availed to heal the schism, he entered without any delay into the opposite system. We observe that the Fratricelli are enumerated among the *heretics* condemned in an edict which he published in 1317; and in the year following he made them the object of a memorable bull:—"The glorious Church which has neither stain nor wrinkle, which Christ loved, and for which he delivered himself to death, that he might sanctify it by washing it with water in the Word of Life—this Church the Prophet knew by the revela-

tion of the Spirit to be placed before all nations ; and admiring the splendour of so much dignity, he exhibited it under the similitude of royalty, saying—A queen stood on thy right hand, in gilded garments, &c. &c.*† After describing the nature of the union between Christ and his spouse the Church, and especially eulogising the charity of the latter, the Pope proceeded to expose the errors of the Minorites. He classed them under five heads, and showed how they combined the various enormities of the Donatists, of the Waldenses, and the Manicheans, while they also followed the ‘foul traces’ of Montanus† and Priscilla. The burden of their offence was contempt of the ‘bonds of the Church,’ and disrespect for its ministers ; howbeit, being convicted by the edict of John of certain condemned and stigmatized heresies, they were consigned by the same act to inquisitorial authority. The agents of oppression executed their part with no delay ; and the very same year four of the Fratricelli were seized at Marseilles, and burnt to death.

From this moment the contest assumed a much more serious character. The devotion of the Spirituals was now sealed, and their resistance sanctified, by the blood of their martyrs ; their zeal, their activity, their numbers everywhere increased ; and the more violent were the proceedings of the inquisitors, the more advocates did the persecuted acquire, the more generally they rose into respect and consideration. Their great principle respecting the poverty of Christ was now made the subject of solemn deliberation ; and the most celebrated divines of the age, especially those of Paris, were officially consulted on the question, and finally the Pope himself descended into the field of controversy—and happier had been his fortunes, and his memory more honoured, had he confined his hostility to that bloodless warfare. At the end of 1322 he published a Constitution, in which he confuted the arguments of the Franciscans, and asserted for the monastic orders the right of property, instead of the simple *use* of their immediate necessities. The Spirituals rejected the right with the same obstinacy, with which it was dictated by the Pope ; and it was at least a singular contest, and worthy of a more

* ‘*Gloriosam Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam, quam Christus dilexit, pro qua semet ipsum tradidit, &c. Nimirum ipsa Christi Sponsa Virgo Mater Ecclesia, quia in cyto Capiti suo Domino Jesu Christo inviolabilis fidei glutino copulatur, et ejus imperio prona obedientia subternitur, cum illo unum effecta, tam incomparabilis unionis merito rebus omnibus, more regio, principatur. Quæ dum pia et devota religione terrena despiciat, cælestia petit, omne sinistrum premens, à dextris Sponsi gloriosa consistit. Et quia geminæ charitatis splendore omni ex parte rutilat, in vestitu aureo etiam angelicis spiritibus admiranda coruscat. Cujus inæstimabilis decor, quia vario vivendi genere in una tamen charitate perficitur, quasi de vestis pulcherrima varietate letatur.* . . .’ Such were the senseless and even impious rhapsodies, with which a very bad pope celebrated the corrupt church, which he still further corrupted by his acts and his eulogies ;—not that he was really blind to its deformities, but because he was too timid or too wicked to correct them, and because he believed that the system, with all its vices upon its head, would still last and be profitable for his own time.

† In the account of Montanus (given in Chap. V. p. 69.) it is too confidently asserted that *he professed to be the Paraclete or Comforter*. It is indeed the deliberate opinion of Mosheim that he professed to be the Paraclete, sent down to complete the Christian system ; but that writer supposes the fanatic to have distinguished between the Paraclete and the Holy Spirit, and not to have proceeded so far as to assert his identity with the latter. Bishop Kaye is of opinion that Montanus only laid claims to *inspiration* by the Holy Ghost ; and he certainly shows that the distinction, supposed to have been between the Holy Ghost and the Paraclete, has no foundation. It seems probable that the bishop’s opinion is correct. At least the only alternative is to believe, that Montanus pretended to be the Holy Ghost—an absurdity by no means unparalleled in the history of heresy.

religious age and more reasonable motives, where the one party indig-
nantly repudiated the worldly possessions, which the other imperiously
obtruded—where a body of beggars preferred the endurance of a deadly
persecution to the sacrifice of the duty of poverty.

In this manner the dispute proceeded, until the rupture between John
and Lewis of Bavaria became open and decided. Then the Emperor, as
if to turn against the Church the old ecclesiastical policy, hastened to
profit by the divisions of his adversary, and to foment the spiritual
rebellion. The provinces of the empire were thrown open to all the
denominations of schism and heresy; and the multiform enemies of
papacy found refuge in the dominions of Lewis, and honour at his court.
Marsilius of Padua, Cæsenas, Bonagratia, and William Occam, were the
most illustrious among those exiles. They directed their eloquence,
their learning, and their satire, both personally against John, and gen-
erally against the system of the Church; and their writings, which were
eagerly read even by that generation, were transmitted with still greater
profit to a less prejudiced posterity.

On the other hand, the Pope* was ardently supported by his Domi-
nican emissaries. Their thirst for heretical blood was heated by a parti-
cular jealousy of the Franciscan Order. Wherever an avenue was open
they penetrated. They pursued the fugitives even into the remote plains
of Poland and Hungary, and introduced into those ignorant regions the
machinery of the Inquisition. But France and Italy† were the scene of
their most successful exertions; and these were not confined to the ponti-
ficate of John. Even the virtuous Benedict began his reign by an
anathema against the Fratricelli; and it is remarkable, that, in the Con-
stitution which he published on this occasion‡, the articles of their heresy
are swelled to fifty-five. Their denial of *the power of the Pope to permit
them to have property* is among the most curious, and not the least grave,
of their offences;—some very gross absurdities were also imputed to them,
which may have been calumniously, as indeed they may have been truly,
alleged. . . . But there is one observation here necessary, which will
tend to account for the great multiplicity and vagueness of the charges
advanced. A furious war was at that time raging in Italy between the
imperial and papal factions; and it was a part of the crooked policy of
the churchmen of Rome to confound political enmity with spiritual per-
versity, and to brand the adversaries of the visible church with the crime of
heretical depravity. Among the adversaries of the church they usually
classed its reformers—those who were indeed its only real friends; and
thus it happened, that the term heresy came now to comprehend every
opinion unfavourable to the ecclesiastical government of the day, and the
gates of the Inquisition received without distinction a various and indis-
criminate multitude.

Still, as long as the reign of Lewis continued, a secure asylum was

* The history of John XXII. abounds with edicts against the various denominations
of heresy. We are also bound to mention that he published (in 1326) one Constitution
to repress the *too great zeal* of certain inquisitors in Sicily; but when we examine the
nature of that zeal, we find that it had ventured to attack '*nostros et apostolicæ sedis
officiales vel nuntios, &c.*' John, as well as several other popes, extended more pro-
tection to the Jews than they enjoyed elsewhere.

† Vit. John XXII. ap. Baluz. Mosheim calculates, from various records published and
unpublished, that the names of about two thousand persons, of both sexes, may be enu-
merated, who suffered martyrdom in France and Italy for their inflexible attachment to
the poverty of St. Francis. Cent. xiv. p. 2. ch. ii.

‡ Bzov. ad ann. 1335. s. ii.

offered to all descriptions of Dissenters; and these, being already connected by one common principle and one common wrong, may have adopted from each other the absurd opinions, which some of them certainly held. But the spirit which united them was deep animosity against the Pope, whom they accused in their turn of impiety and usurpation. In the year 1345*, Lewis was succeeded by Charles IV.; and as that Prince was chiefly obliged for his elevation to pontifical influence, so his policy followed the interests of the Court of Avignon. If the principles of the Bavarian had continued to govern his dominions for another generation, it is not improbable that the empire would have wholly freed itself from papal supremacy, and raised the banners of Reformation in the fourteenth century with no inconsiderable advantage to religion. But such anticipation of the more perfect triumph of a more enlightened age was cut short by the perfidy† of the Imperial counsels. The numerous insurgents against the despotism of Rome, whom Lewis had encouraged and protected and created, were betrayed by his successor into the hands of the avenger. The peaceful provinces of the empire, hitherto sacred from the inroads of persecution, were now thrown open to the Dominicans. Their irruption was supported by secular edicts and arms; and the extirpation of the 'Voluntary beggars'—the enemies of the Church and the '*Roman empire*,'—was pressed with equal ardour by the pope and the emperor. The houses of the offenders were given to the tribunal of the Inquisition, to be converted into prisons for heretics‡; and their effects were publicly sold, for the equal profit of the inquisitors who ordered, of the magistrates who enforced, and of the poor who witnessed, their execution. The survivors fled towards the banks of the Rhine, to Switzerland, Brabant and Pomerania; but they were followed by a tempest of mandates and bulls, and hunted by the keen Dominicans even into their most distant retreats; till at length it is admitted, that the greater part of Germany was restored, after this sanguinary purification, to the peaceful embrace of the Church.

But neither edicts, nor bulls, nor inquisitors, could suppress the spirit of the schism, though they might extinguish its name; and those who preserved their obedience to the more rigid rule, were still found to be so numerous, and the love of that discipline was still in some provinces so prevalent, that the popes at length thought proper to sanction the Institution. Accordingly, the Franciscan Order was by authority divided into two bodies, which subsist to this day—the more indulgent were called the Conventual Brethren—the more austere, the Brethren of Observance. The disputes which afterwards disturbed this arrangement were partial and insignificant; and the historian may express his astonishment mixed with

* About the same time died William Occham, 'pestilentiſſimus Hæresiarcha.'—Bzovius (ann. 1347, s. xxxvi.), though he designates this Englishman to have been 'omnium inceptor malorum, auctor scelerum, cultor tenebrarum, &c. &c.,' still does not attribute his death to divine interposition;—which is the more surprising, because he had not hesitated to pronounce somewhat earlier (ann. 1321, s. xxi.) that Dante died through the peculiar vengeance of Heaven, which visited his calumnies against the popes.

† This is no ground perhaps for imputing to Charles *personally*, that his intolerance was aggravated by treachery. The individual stands convicted of persecution only. But the circumstance of this change adds one to the many instances, in which the steady, consistent perseverance of the Vatican has carried its point, through the fluctuations of the Imperial policy.

‡ See Mosheim, Cent. xrv. p. ii. ch. ii. Their crime is mentioned in the edict (published at Lucca in 1369) which condemns them. 'They are a pernicious sect, who pretend to a *sacerilegious* and heretical *poverty*, and who are under a vow that they neither ought to have, nor will have, any property, whether special or common, in the goods they use—which they extend even to their wretched habits.'

sorrow, that so simple a method of reconciliation could only be reached through the paths of intolerance and oppression.

The term Beghard was in this age commonly applied to the Tertiaries of St. Francis; and, though in its origin probably innocent of such principles, it was now involved in the guilt and fate of the anti-papal heresies. The 'Brethren of the free spirit,' the harmless mystics of the last century*, had been some time known by that appellation; and sometimes they are designated as *Lollards*, in the records of the following age. The reason of their confusion is, that both names were indiscriminately used by the Church to stigmatize those who dissented from it, without any new inquiry as to the grounds and points of their dissent. Mosheim, who has investigated this subject with great diligence, considers the Lollards† to have been a society of pious laymen, formed in the first instance at Antwerp, for the purpose of visiting the sick and burying the dead during a season of pestilence; for the clergy are affirmed to have deserted their official duties, as soon as they became attended with peril. The humane motives and religious practice of the new society caused it to spread throughout Flanders and many parts of Germany, and it was encouraged by the respect of the magistrates and the love of the inhabitants. Its success excited the jealousy, as indeed it reflected on the reputation, of all the clergy; but the Mendicants had perhaps a deeper motive for animosity against it, when they found that their own profits suffered through its gratuitous charity. Accordingly, they raised the customary clamours of impiety and heresy: under the mask of extraordinary holiness, the Lollards concealed forsooth the blackest errors and the most enormous vices! they were denounced at the pontifical throne, and their name has passed into the language of the Church to designate a misbelieving and sanctified hypocrite.

They may have held some foolish opinions—among those generally attributed to them the following are the most peculiar: that the mind ought to be called away from the external and sensible parts of religion, and fixed on inward and spiritual worship; that the soul which is wholly absorbed in the love of God is free from the restraint of every law, and may gratify its natural appetites without sin; that perfect virtue and perfect beatitude may be obtained in this world; and that persons so circumstanced are removed above every worldly consideration; so that the moral virtues, as well as the religious ceremonies, might be neglected without offence. Moreover they pretended that there were two Churches, the carnal Church, which was that of Rome; the spiritual, which was confined to their own society‡. . . Such were the crimes imputed to

* See Mosheim, Cent. xiii. p. ii. ch. v.

† Mosheim, Cent. xiv. p. ii. ch. ii. The word Lollard means a *singer*—as Beghard means one who *prays*. The former were also called the 'Cellite brethren and sisters—the Alexian brethren'—from the cells in which they lived, and the saint who was their patron. See Semler, *Secl.* xiv. cap. i.

‡ Other charges are instanced by Bzovius (ann. 1307, s. ix.) They held that the Mass, Baptism and Extreme Unction were useless ceremonies; that Lucifer was an injured being, and that the angels, as well as all the enemies of their own sect, would be finally condemned; that Mary did not continue a virgin after the nativity; that the body of the Lord in the Eucharist was not real; that marriage was only sanctified whoredom; that God neither punished nor regarded human sins. Besides this, they lay together promiscuously under the pretence of charity; they ate flesh when they would; they observed no festivals and derided the merits and intercession of the saints; and finally they were so obstinate under persecution, that whatever might be their sex or age, they

them by the Churchmen; and this last may really have been the secret of their offence. Yet, though we should believe them to have held almost every tenet with which they are charged, (for the contempt of moral duties was clearly not a tenet, but a consequence calumniously drawn by their enemies,) may we not discern, that the principle from which they departed was excellent and holy? It led them into some extravagances; but were those so gross, or nearly so detestable, as the deliberate absurdities which were committed by the Church itself during the same period?—the insertion into the Liturgy of ‘the words in which the angel Gabriel saluted the Virgin Mary’—the institution of festivals in honour of the lance, the nails, the crown of Christ*—the appointment of a holy day for the solemn celebration of the wounds of Christ, miraculously impressed upon the body of St. Francis! If we should believe all the calumnies that churchmen have ever fabricated in vilification of the Mystics, we shall find among them nothing so irrational, nothing nearly so impious, as those authorized ecclesiastical mummeries.

The Lollards suffered some oppression in Austria and other countries; but a war of extermination does not appear to have been formally proclaimed against them. No doubt, they were confounded by the inquisitors, sometimes erroneously and sometimes wilfully, with the more avowed enemies of the papal government; and thus they shared that vengeance, which was chiefly intended for the Spirituals and Beghards. But whether through their greater obscurity or more manifest harmlessness, they escaped in comparative safety, without any direct attack,—and to this tolerance it may perhaps be attributed, that the sect of the Lollards† (properly so called) never rose into great power and never became dangerous to the Catholic Church.

During the reign of Clement V., a preacher named Dulcinus, attended by a woman called Margaret, his wife or his mistress, presented himself in Lombardy, and erected in the neighbouring mountains the standard of heresy. He was charged with contempt of the Catholic hierarchy, and with censuring the abuses of their immoderate wealth; also with asserting a succession of three theocracies—that those under the Father and the Son were already passed; that the third, under the Holy Spirit, was then in operation‡. Lastly, to consummate his odium, his followers, who were not very numerous, were assailed with the primitive and accustomed calumny of promiscuous

unanimously preferred death to conversion. . . . In this strange and calumnious catalogue we may observe the malignity, with which some tenets, merely rejecting the innovations of Rome, are mixed up with the most horrible crimes and blasphemies. Yet this was one of the most vulgar among the artifices of the Churchmen of those days.

* Others might be added. For instance, John XXII. re-established with fresh indulgences the festival of ‘the body of Christ’—granting to all Christians a general pardon of forty days for every reverence made, on the name of Jesus Christ being pronounced by the priest. Giovanni Villani, lib. ii. cap. lxxix.

† The name Lollard, as is well known, was afterwards generally applied to various adversaries of the popish establishment; but the real origin both of the name and sect was probably such as has been here described.

‡ His followers called themselves ‘The Spiritual Congregation and the Order of the Apostles.’ ‘We alone (they said) are in the perfection in which the apostles were, and in the liberty which proceeds immediately from Jesus Christ. Wherefore we acknowledge obedience neither to the pope nor any other human being: nor has he any power to excommunicate us The pope can give no absolution from sins unless he be as holy as St. Peter, living in entire poverty and humility . . . so that all the popes and prelates, since St. Sylvester, having deviated from that original holiness, are prevaricators and seducers, with the single exception of Pope Celestine, Pietro di Morone, &c.’ See Fleury, liv. xci. sec. xxiii.

prostitution. A *crusade* was preached by the Church against these miserable enthusiasts, and its enemies were led to the assault by a zealous bishop. Surrounded and pressed among the Alpine passes, many had already perished from cold and want, before the sword was drawn to complete their destruction. It did so most effectually; and Roman Catholic writers record without emotion, that the heretic was torn in pieces limb from limb, after his 'Spiritual Sister' had suffered before his eyes by the same torture. As the massacre is recorded without emotion, so its consequence is told without understanding or reflection—that the disciples of the martyr were multiplied by the deed, and increased beyond number*.

The history and heresies † of Wiclif also belong to this period; but we shall at present leave them unnoticed, as more immediately appertaining to English history, and already familiar to most readers. And if we pass from the name of that great patriarch of the Reformation to the mention of a transient sect of mere fanatics, we shall most faithfully exhibit the character of an age, in which the long reign of ignorance and error was first disturbed by the irregular struggles of reviving reason. The beginnings of those great revolutions, which renovate the whole frame of society, are invariably marked by some transient excesses, occasioned by the first fermentation of new and active principles, in a body not yet qualified to give them full efficacy. And so it befell in the present instance—an age, in which the true principles of Christianity were beginning once more to glimmer through the ecclesiastical system which had so long obscured them, was troubled by some of the wildest absurdities of superstition.

The sect of the Flagellants first betrayed its existence about the middle of the thirteenth century; but it was discouraged by the authorities both spiritual and secular, and seemingly repressed: nevertheless, about the year 1340, it broke out again with additional violence. Its first re-appearance was in Italy, in the neighbourhood of Cremona‡: suddenly a multitude, amounting to ten thousand persons, issued from the surrounding cities and villages, and paraded the country, flogging themselves and (in the first instance) begging. The contagion spread with a rapidity which will afflict, but cannot surprise, the observer of religious absurdities; and in the course of ten years scarcely a country in Europe was exempt from its visitation. As the Flagellants increased in numbers, they adopted some sort of system and method in their fanaticism; which, though it may have varied under different circumstances, possessed the same general character. Naked from the loins upwards, and marked on their front and back with red crosses, they spread themselves in numerous bands over the face of Europe. Twice every day, in the most public places, they performed their discipline, until blood flowed from the wounds; and they completed their duties by one nocturnal and private flagellation. No one among them begged. No one was admitted into the society who was entirely destitute; no one, unless he had made a full confession of his sins, unless he had received the consent of his wife, unless

* Supra numerum. See Vita (4ta) Clementis V. apud Baluzium. Bzovius, ad ann. 1310. sec. xiii.

† Wiclif's Sixty-one Heresies are carefully enumerated by Bzovius, (ann. 1352, s. xv.) and that author expresses very sincere regret at his escape from the bishops, whom the pope had stirred against him. Indeed, notwithstanding his great protectors, the Reformer seems not to have been secure till the grand schism frittered away the power of papacy.

‡ Bzov. ann. 1340, s. xxiv.

he had forgiven his enemies every injury *. Their appearance and character chiefly moved the enthusiasm of the Germans, who opened their doors and entertained them at their tables. But it is affirmed, that they could never be persuaded to partake twice of the same hospitality, nor to prolong their visit beyond a single day: they then departed on their destination. Women were confounded with men in their irregular ranks; and as they advanced in indiscriminate procession, each bearing in his hand a wooden cross, they chaunted in their native language a hymn on the Passion of Christ, and frequently interrupted their song by prostration and prayer. Their eyes were ever downcast, and the aspect which they wore was solemn and sorrowful.

The innocence of their demeanour, the severity of their discipline, the very singularity of their enthusiasm attracted a multitude of proselytes; but as their numbers increased, their conduct no longer escaped reproach, and the offences of individuals threw suspicion and obloquy on the whole body. Moreover, as they presently began to preach to the people, and as their society was not authorised by the pope, many Lollards and schismatics eagerly mingled in their companies, and carried into them the name of heresy, and subjected them to that fatal charge. Accordingly, we read in the Roman Catholic records, that the Flagellants were a sect who slighted the priesthood and *the Gospel*—who had no reverence for the holy ceremonies, or even for the body of the Lord: such was the confidence (says Spondanus) which they placed in their own madness. By thirty-three consecutive days of flagellation, they held themselves absolved from the most heinous sins, to the disregard of the salutary penance and indulgences of the Church. And lastly, they maintained, that stripes were more honourable than martyrdom; that the baptism by water had passed away, and given place to the baptism by blood; and that through this last alone was there any road to salvation †. These charges were partly fabricated, and no doubt partly true; and even the limits of the truth and the falsehood are not difficult to discern; but the agents of persecution, who were presently in motion, were not retarded by any such considerations. They marched onwards in the path of destruction; and the Emperor Charles IV. encouraged and directed their zeal. It appears that, in the year 1351, a number of those pitiable enthusiasts were collected in Lithuania, in the exercise of their absurd practices. Pope Clement VI. proclaimed a holy war ‡; the Master of the Teutonic order marched in person against them; and after a solemn fast and public prayer, that God would aid him in the extirpation of His enemies, for the glory of His Holy Name, he assaulted them, and massacred eight thousand: the remainder, about two thousand more, were carried away captive into Prussia, that they might be restored, by a second baptism, to the bosom of the Church.

When we examine the various denominations of heresy which appeared in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and in the fourteenth most especially, we observe that almost all were directed, wholly or in part, openly or covertly, in tenet or in practice, against the sa-

General Character of these Heresies.

* See Bzov. ann. 1349, s. ii. It is the testimony of an enemy. Spondanus (ann. 1349, sect. ii.) who confirms these particulars, also mentions that the Flagellants professed the authority of a letter, or writing, sent down to them from heaven.

† See Mosheim, Cent. xiii. p. ii. chap. iii., and Cent. xiv. p. ii. ch. v.

‡ Bzov., ann. 1351, s. viii. The pretext alleged for this expedition was, that when two Mendicants, on some occasion, interrupted the devotion of the Flagellants, these had stoned one of them to death. It does not appear that they were armed.

cerdotal government and the system of the Roman Church. It was not so with those of earlier ages. Among the numerous sects which divided the ante-Nicene Christians, it has been already remarked, that not one originated in any disaffection for the ministers of religion, or the ecclesiastical polity. In the times which followed, the Arian and Incarnation controversies, with their numerous names and progeny, were confined to matters of faith. During the prolonged disputes which succeeded about the worship of images, no clamour was raised against the corruptions or undue aggrandizement of the hierarchy. The dissensions of the ninth century regarded the nature of the Eucharist and the doctrine of Fatalism, and the former of those subjects was revived in the eleventh; but no sect had hitherto risen in revolt against the abuses and tyranny of the Church. The standard was first erected in the twelfth age; and from that moment there was never wanting a succession of bold and righteous spirits who rallied round it. The depravity of the church system was indeed, in some respects, more scandalous in the fourteenth, than in any preceding century: yet was there no lack, even in much earlier ages, of such enormities, as might well have offended the reason and provoked the indignation of an evangelical Christian. But the fact was, that the civil institutions were at the same time so defective, and the dearth of knowledge so general, that the sins of the Church were overshadowed or kept in countenance by the secular depravity that surrounded them. Presently, as the social condition improved, the ecclesiastical abuses excited remonstrance and clamour; the foundations were shaken, and the edifice itself assailed; but the clamour was still the clamour of the few—the voice of enlightened individuals or of scattered sects: it did not yet endanger the established hierarchy, because it was not yet supported by the general prevalence of rational principles. The political system of the age still abounded with vices, and the learning in fashion was still perplexed with prejudice and fallacy. It is always with reference to such considerations as these, that we are to estimate the danger of ecclesiastical abuses and the necessity of reformation. It is not sufficient to compare existing defects with those which have been tolerated in the same church, or in a different church, in a different age. Such a comparison would only tend to blind and mislead us. They must be examined in relation to the measure of civilization actually abroad—to the prevalence of knowledge, to the authority of reason, to the general principles of human conduct. Thus it will happen, that a much slighter defect, in days of improvement and inquiry, may prove more perilous to the system in which it is suffered to remain, than a much grosser deformity in a darker age:—it is the access of light which renders the stain conspicuous and offensive. And therefore it has ever been among the foremost duties of churchmen, and their surest wisdom, to detect the blemishes in their institution, and having detected, to remove them: since it avails them little to be free from the vices of preceding generations, unless they share the spirit, and adopt, to a great extent, the character and principles of their own.

NOTE ON THE FRANCISCANS AND OTHER MENDICANTS.

(I.) As something has been said in this chapter respecting the intestine divisions of the Franciscans, it is proper here to mention the sect of the *Fratricelli*, or Ultra-Spirituals, who made some figure in the dissensions of the fourteenth age. They arose, in that which preceded, from the stock of St. Francis; and as they disclaimed any right even to the

use* of property; in which they surpassed the self-denial of the Spirituals, they may have deserved the praise which they arrogated, of being the *genuine* disciples of their Master. They professed great personal respect for Celestine V., who had been in some measure the founder of their Order; but they hesitated to acknowledge the legitimacy of his successors: they proclaimed the deep corruption of the Church, and they looked with ardent and almost pious enthusiasm for its immediate reformation.

This notion—that a thorough regeneration of the Church was near at hand, and that the reign of the true gospel was to be restored by the followers of St. Francis—was *The Eternal Gospel*, not the creation of the Fratricelli, nor was it indeed of very recent origin. As early as the beginning of the thirteenth century, a work was circulated, abounding with such like prophecies, under the name of the *Eternal Gospel*. It was founded on the text †—‘I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the Everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth;’ and it was such, as Mosheim has designated it, the senseless production of an obscure, silly and visionary writer. The perfect scheme of revelation which it propounded was this—as there were three persons in the godhead, so was it necessary that there should be three dispensations. The first was that of the Father, which ended at the coming of Christ—the second was that of the Son, which was now on the point of concluding, to give place to the third, and last. This rhapsody was ascribed, but not with sufficient foundation, to Joachim, abbot of Flora in Calabria, who flourished about the year 1200; who had declaimed against the abuses of the Church, and predicted their extirpation. But in spite of the respectable name, under which it had sought protection, the *Eternal Gospel* would not perhaps have attracted any general notice, had it not been adopted by the Franciscans, who eagerly appropriated the prophecies. Accordingly, about the year 1250, it was again published, with an elaborate Introduction, in which the assertion was advanced, that St. Francis was the angel mentioned in the Revelations; that the gospel of Christ was immediately to give place to this new and everlasting scripture; and that the ministers of this great Reformation were to be humble and barefooted friars, destitute of all earthly possessions ‡.

The Gospel might have passed unnoticed and despised; but the introduction contained a doctrine too daring, if not dangerous, to escape ecclesiastical reprehension; and in the very year following its publication at Paris, the book was suppressed by Alexander IV. Yet such was the tenderness of a Pope for the reputation of the Mendicants, that the censures were lenient, and the edict was issued with reluctance.

The introduction has been commonly ascribed to no less distinguished an ecclesiastic than John of Parma, General of the Franciscans; though the opinion is more probable that it was composed by one Gerard, his friend. It is true, indeed, that writers of that order have entirely disclaimed the work, and imputed it to their rivals, the Dominicans, but without any plausible reason. And as the introduction was manifestly

* In 1279, Nicholas III. published a celebrated Constitution known as the Bull *Exiit*, in which he so interpreted the Franciscan Rule, as to prohibit to its observers every possession; but to permit them the temporary use of houses, books, &c. of which the property, in conformity with the edict of Innocent IV., was to reside in the Church of Rome.

† Revelations, xiv. 6.

‡ This account is chiefly taken from Mosheim (Cent. XIII. p. ii. ch. ii.) who has investigated the subject with great diligence.

a Franciscan fabrication, so is it extremely probable that the Eternal Gospel also proceeded from the same forge.

We should also mention one Pierre Jean d'Olive, a native of Seignan, in Languedoc, who acquired some reputation towards the end of the same century, by a similar description of merit. He, likewise, was a leader of the Spirituals, a disciple of the Abbot Joachim, and a reformer of ecclesiastical iniquities. He published a work called *Postilla*, a commentary on the Revelations, in which he boldly denounced the Roman Church as the 'Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mistress of Harlots, and abominations of the Earth*.' But he mixed so much wild and senseless superstition with his reforming zeal, that his labours were neither profitable to the Church, nor dangerous to the despotism of the Pope.

(II.) We read from time to time of disputes, which arose in various countries between the Mendicants and the secular clergy, respecting the administration of several Church ceremonies, but most especially of the rite of Confession. It may, therefore, be useful to trace very concisely the history of that contest. A canon of the Fourth Lateran Council (commonly known

as *Omnis utriusque Sexus*) gave the entire power of receiving confessions to the priest; but Gregory IX., by a bull of Sept. 26, 1227, opened that privilege also to the Preachers. The curés resisted; and in 1250 the Faculty of Paris loudly declared in their favour: so that Innocent IV., who in 1244 had shown every disposition to favour the Mendicants, prohibited them, in 1254, from hearing confessions without the permission of the priest. But Alexander IV. immediately revoked this bull, and presently afterwards issued others, to the interest of the Mendicants. Great heats were thus excited, and in the hope to allay them, Martin IV. published, in 1282, a sort of edict of compromise, by which the Mendicants were permitted to receive confessions, yet so that the same persons were still obliged to confess once a year to their own priest, according to the canon of the Lateran.

Thereon arose a fresh question—whether the people were obliged again to confess to their curés the same sins which they had before confided to the Mendicants, and for which they had received absolution; and various appeals were made to the Popes on this point. Nicholas IV. delivered no express response; but Boniface VIII. published a decretal called *Supra Cathedram*, in which he engaged to grant the privilege to the Mendicants by his own plenitude, in case they had previously asked the favour of the Bishops, and it had been refused. Benedict XI. was still more decided; for he gave the Mendicants direct permission to hear confessions, and also decided that the people were not obliged to reconfess the same sins. This decretal, again, was revoked in the Council of Vienne, and replaced by the Clementine *Dudum*, which revived the Constitution of Boniface.

The above account, which is the bare outline of a tedious and angry controversy, is nevertheless sufficient to exhibit, not only the obstinacy with which the contending parties advanced or defended their privileges—not only the value which both of them affixed to the possession of that particular privilege, which contained indeed the grand secret of ecclesiastical influence, but also the vacillating policy of the Vatican, and the little consistency with each other or with themselves, which directed, in their councils, the chiefs of an infallible Church.

* Revelations xvii. 5.

CHAPTER XXIII.

The Grand Schism of the Roman Catholic Church.

Remonstrance of the Bishops to the College—its reply—The Conclave—Terrible state of popular intimidation—Constitution of the Conclave—various designs of the parties—violence of the people—Election of the Archbishop of Bari, Urban VI.—his character, and general reception—his first acts of harshness, and their effect—The Cardinals retire to Anagni, and annul the election of Urban—they choose Robert, Cardinal of Geneva, Clement VII.—his character—real merits of the question—Retreat of Clement to Avignon—Division of Europe—St. Catharine and other enthusiasts—Conduct of Urban to six Cardinals accused of conspiracy—Death of Urban, and election of Boniface IX.—The Jubilee—its extension—Sale of indulgences—Privileges granted to some German towns—Exertions of the University of Paris for the extinction of the Schism—Address to the King—three methods proposed in it—favourable circumstances—Death of Clement VII.—Election of Pietro di Luna, Benedict XIII.—Grand embassy of the King to Benedict—its failure—Continued exertions of the King and the University—attempts to influence Boniface—his assurance to the Roman deputies—The French withdraw their obedience from Benedict—Blockade of the palace at Avignon—Benedict restored to liberty and office—simoniacal rapacity of Boniface—The Jubilee of 1400—Boniface succeeded by Innocent VII.—Death of Innocent—Solemn engagement of the Conclave—Election of Angelo Corrario, Gregory XI.—Attempt at a conference—Perjury of Gregory—Retirement of Benedict to Perpignan—Convocation of the Council of Pisa—proceedings of that council—deposition of the two competitors—and election of Alexander V.—his birth and character—Conduct of the Antipopes—Intercourse of Alexander with the Roman people—his death—Election of Baltazar Cossa, John XXIII.—Sigismund emperor—Convocation of the Council of Constance—choice of the place—its advantages—numbers of members—its objects—Proposition of John XXII.—Two opinions respecting the course to be followed—Arrival of Sigismund—Question as to the power of the Council over the Pope—division of the Council—it decides on the method of cession—cession of the Pope—suspicions of the Council—Escape of John from Constance—Question *de asseribilitate Papæ*—the Pope betrayed to Sigismund—his deposition, and the charges against him—his sentence—conduct and imprisonment—opinions of the justice of the sentence—Sigismund goes to Perpignan—Conference there—Union of all parties—Obstinacy of Benedict—he retires to Peniscola—is deposed by the Council of Constance—his conduct—the Council proceeds to the election of a new pope—Otho Colonna, Martin V. chosen—Observations—Death of Angelo Corrario—Fertility, death, and character of Pietro di Luna—Fate of John XXIII.—his liberation—return to Italy—counsels of his friends—he goes to Florence, and makes his submission to Martin—his treatment, conduct, and character.

THE number of Cardinals at the death of Gregory XI. was twenty-three, of whom six were absent at Avignon, and one was legate in Tuscany. The remaining sixteen, after celebrating the funeral ceremonies of the deceased, and appointing certain officers to secure their deliberations from violence, prepared to enter into conclave. But the rites of sepulture were scarcely performed, when the leading magistrates of Rome presented to them a remonstrance to this effect:—On behalf of the Roman senate and people, they ventured to represent, that the Roman Church had suffered for seventy years a deplorable captivity by the translation of the Holy See to Avignon; that during that period the capital of the Christian world had suffered more, both in its spiritual and temporal interests, than when it was subject to the cruel domination of the barbarians; that tumults, seditions, revolts, and sanguinary wars, had desolated, without interruption, the ecclesiastical states; that its cities and its provinces were in part usurped by domestic tyrants, and occupied in part by the neighbouring republics, or by the Lombard princes; that fire and sword were carried even to the gates of Rome, which had neither power nor authority to repress such fury;—so that the aspect of the Holy City, the head of religion, formerly venerable throughout the whole earth, was no longer to be recognised through its strange and foul disfigurements. That the sacred edifices, those august monuments of ancient piety, were left without honour, or ornament, or reparation, nodding to their ruin; that even the *Tiſles* of the cardinals, abandoned by those who derived their dignities from them, were left without roof, or gates, or walls, the abode of beasts, which

cropped the grass on their very altars. That the Faithful were no longer attracted to Rome, either by devotion, which the profanation of the churches precluded, or by interest; since the Pope, the source of patronage, had scandalously deserted his church—so that there was danger, lest that unfortunate city should be reduced to a vast and frightful solitude, and become an outcast from the world, of which it was still the spiritual empress, as it once had been the temporal. Lastly, that, as the only remedy for these evils, it was absolutely necessary to elect a Roman, or at least an Italian Pope—especially as there was every appearance that the people, if disappointed in their just expectation, would have recourse to compulsion. . . . The Cardinals replied, that as soon as they should be in conclave they would give to those subjects their solemn deliberation, and direct their choice according to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. They repelled the notion, that they could be influenced by any popular menace; and pronounced (according to one account) an express warning, that if they should be compelled to elect under such circumstances, the elected would not be a pope, but an intruder*. They then immediately entered into conclave.

In the meantime the populace, who had already exhibited proofs of impatience, and whom the answer of the cardinals was not well calculated to satisfy, assembled in great crowds about the place of assembly. It may be true (though the circumstances rest for the most part on French and partial authority), that the civil magistrates had previously possessed themselves of the keys of the gates, which were usually confided to ecclesiastical officers, in order to preclude the escape of the cardinals to a more secure place of deliberation; that in the room of the ordinary police they introduced a number of *Mantaurii*, the wild and lawless inhabitants of the adjacent mountains, who paraded the streets in arms by day and by night; that a quantity of dry reeds and other combustibles was heaped together under the windows of the conclave, with threats of conflagration; that, at the moment when the College was proceeding to election, the bells of the Capitol and St. Peter's were sounded to arms†:—these, and other circumstances of direct constraint and intimidation, are asserted by some writers, and though probably exaggerated, have undoubtedly some foundation in truth. But it is without any dispute, that a vast crowd of people continued in tumultuous assemblage during the whole deliberation of the conclave‡, and that the debates of the Sacred College were incessantly interrupted by one loud and unanimous shout—*‘Romano lo volemo lo Papa—Romano lo volemo—o almanco almanco Italiano!’*—*‘We will have a Roman for Pope—a Roman, or at least, at the very least, an Italian!’*

Let us now inquire, whether the College was then so constituted, as to make it likely that its free choice would have fallen upon a Roman, or even an Italian. Of the sixteen cardinals in conclave, eleven were French, one, Pietro di Luna, a Spaniard, and four Italians. The unanimity of the French would, of course, at once have decided the question; but it happened that they were divided into two parties. Seven amongst them were Limousins, natives of the same province; and having succeeded

* ‘Quam si facerent, eos ex nunc avisaverunt, quod si ex ejus occasione aliquem eligerent ille non esset papa sed intrusus.’—Aut. Vit. Greg. XI. ap. Bosquet. Maimb. Hist. du Grand Schisme, liv. i.

† *Ad sturnum*, according to the Roman expression of that time.

‡ Spondanus, ann. 1378, s. viii. et seq.

during the last twenty-nine years, in electing four successive popes from their own country, they were naturally eager to keep possession of so profitable a distinction. But the other four, unwilling to appropriate the pontificate to a single district, even though that district was French, designed that the choice should fall on one of themselves. The Limousins found in their superior numbers their hope of success and their excuse for perseverance; and at length the others, being more keenly excited by provincial than by national jealousy, began to turn their thoughts to a coalition with the Italians. These last were equally bent on the election of one of their own party; and as their only chance of success arose from the division of the French, they very readily joined their forces against the exclusive ambition of the Limousins. Such were the intrigues which commenced immediately after the death of Gregory, and ripened during the eleven* days which followed; and such was probably† the state of parties when the cardinals entered the conclave. There were materials in abundance for long and angry dissension; and though the indignation of the Limousins against their compatriots might finally have forced their consent to the election of an Italian, rather than a native of any other French province, still it was not without a struggle, that they were likely to forego the courtly magnificence of Avignon, to which a French pontiff would surely have restored them, for a remote and tumultuous residence among the citizens of Rome.

But the internal disputes of the College were speedily silenced by the tempest from without. Even after the sacred body had been shut up in deliberation, the Bannerets, or heads of the twelve regions of the city, forced themselves, together with their disorderly followers, in contempt of custom and decency, into the recesses of the conclave. Here they repeated their demands with redoubled insolence, and direct menaces. The cardinals are recorded to have returned their former reply, with the additional declaration, that in case any violence were used, he, whom they should so elect, and whom the people would take for a real pope, would in fact be no pope at all‡. The people received this answer with indignant clamours§; the disorder round the chapel augmented; the most frightful threats were uttered in case of hesitation or disobedience; and the same shout, which was indeed the burden of the uproar, continued to penetrate the conclave—‘A Roman for our pope! a Roman—or at least, at the very least, an Italian!’

* Gregory XI. died on the 27th of March, and the cardinals entered into conclave on the 7th of April.

† Fleury (liv. xvii. s. xviii.) seems persuaded that there was some secret understanding in favour of the Archbishop of Bari (who was afterwards elected) even before the cardinals entered into conclave. But the view of Maimbourg is more probable, that so wide a division, with so many opposite interests and passions, was not so easily reconciled.

‡ ‘Ista verba manifestè sonant minas; et ideo expressè nos dicimus, quod, si per vos aut ipsos aliqua contra nos attententur, et contingat nos talium occasione et timore aliquem eligere, credetis habere papam et non habebitis, quia non erit.’—Vita Greg. XI. ap. Balusium.

§ One of the cardinals addressed them from the window:—‘State a pace—perchè i Signori Cardinali dicono così, che domani faranno dire una messa dello Spirito Santo, e poi faranno che voi sarete contenti.’ Qui vero Romani maledicti tunc responderunt sic—‘No—mò lo volemo, mò.’ Et interim ridebant inter se, et unus faciebat alteri signum, ut plus clamarent ut supra. In circuitu item Conclavi erat maxima multitudo cum caboris et flautis, et eodem modo clamabant fortiter juxta posse’.—Vita (secunda) Greg. XI. apud Balusium. We should observe, however, that this is not the description of a sanguinary mob.

These were not circumstances for delay or deliberation. If any inclination towards the choice of an Italian had previously existed in the college, it was now confirmed into necessity; and on the very day following their retirement the cardinals were agreed in their election. Howbeit, they studiously passed over the four Italian members of their own body, and casting their eyes beyond the conclave, selected a Neapolitan named Bartolomeo Prignano, the Archbishop of Bari. The announcement was not immediately published, probably through the fear of popular dissatisfaction, because a Roman had not been created; and presently, when the impatience of the people still further increased, the Bishop of Marseilles went to the window, and said to them, 'Go to St. Peter's, and you shall learn the decision.' Whereupon some who heard him, understanding that the Cardinal of St. Peter's, a Roman, had been indeed chosen, rushed to the palace of that prelate, and plundered it—for such was the custom then invariably observed on the election of a pope. Others thronged in great multitudes to offer him their salutations; and then they bore him away to St. Peter's, and placed him, according to ancient usage, upon the altar. It was in vain that the good cardinal, enfeebled by extreme old age and painful disease, disclaimed the title, and trembled at the honours that were forced on him. 'I am not pope,' said he; 'and I will not be antipope. The Archbishop of Bari, who is really chosen, is worthier than I.' They ascribed his resistance to modesty or decent dissimulation, and continued through the whole day to overwhelm him with the most painful proofs of their joy. In the meantime the other cardinals escaped from the conclave in great disorder and trepidation, without dignity or attendants, or even their ordinary habiliments * of office, and sought safety, some in their respective palaces, and others in the Castle of St. Angelo, or even beyond the walls of the city. On the following day, the people were undeceived; and as they showed no strong disinclination for the master who had been really chosen for them, the Archbishop of Bari was solemnly enthroned, and the scattered cardinals reappeared, and rallied round him in confidence and security.

The archbishop's exalted reputation justified the choice of the college, and secured the obedience of the people. Through a long life, devoted to the service of the Church, he had reconciled the most ardent disposition with the most devout humility, and improved by assiduous study a powerful comprehension. He submitted to the utmost severity of ecclesiastical discipline; yet his deep and dangerous enthusiasm did not close his mind against the liberal pursuit of learning, and the patronage of learned men. His zeal for the Church was not stained by the suspicion of bigotry, nor inconsistent with a stern opposition to its abuses; and among many other virtues, he was perhaps chiefly famed for the rigorous exercise of justice. Such was the character to which Rome looked with sanguine hope for the repair of her declining fortunes; nor was it, indeed, without the general approbation of Christendom, that Urban VI. ascended the apostolical chair. The cardinals sent the customary communications to the courts of Europe of the free and canonical election which they had made †, and peaceably assumed their official stations about the person of the pontiff.

* *Recesserunt pedes, unus sine Capa, alter cum Capa, alter sine Capucio, soli, sine sociis scutiferis.*—Vit. Greg. XI. ap. Baluz.

† A similar announcement was made to the six cardinals remaining at Avignon, who immediately recognized the new pope.

The ceremony of coronation was duly performed, and several bishops were assembled on the very following day at vespers in the pontifical chapel, when the Pope unexpectedly *His harshness.* addressed them in the bitterest language of reprobation. He accused them of having deserted and betrayed the flocks which God had confided to them, in order to revel in luxury at the court of Rome; and he applied to their offence the harsh reproach of perjury. One of them (the Bishop of Pampeluna) repelled the charge, as far as himself was concerned, by reference to the duties which he performed at Rome; the others suppressed in silence their anger and confusion. A few days afterwards, at a public consistory, Urban repeated his complaints and denunciations, and urged them still more generally in the presence of his whole court. In a long and intemperate harangue, he arraigned the various vices of the prelates—their simony, their injustice, their exactions, their scandalous luxury, with a number of other offences—in unmeasured* and uncompromising expressions; and while he spared no menace to give weight to his censure, he directed the sharpest of his shafts against the cardinals themselves.... There is not any dispute, that his violence proceeded from an honest zeal for the reformation of the Church; but the end was marred by the passionate indiscretion, with which he pursued it. The consistory broke up; and the members carried away with them no sense of the iniquities imputed, no disposition to correct their habits or their principles, but only indignation, mixed with some degree of fear, against a severe and discourteous censor†.

The cardinals continued, notwithstanding, their attendance at the Vatican for a few weeks longer, and then, as was usual on the approach of the summer heats, they withdrew from the city, with the pope's permission, and retired to Anagni. The four Italians alone remained at Rome. The others were no sooner removed from the immediate inspection of Urban, than they commenced, or at least more boldly pursued, their measures to overthrow him. On the one hand, they opened a direct correspondence with the court of France and university of Paris‡; on the other, they took into their service a body of mercenaries, commanded by one Bernard de la Sale, a Gascon; and then they no longer hesitated to treat the election of Urban as null, through the violence which had attended it§.

To give consequence to this decision, they assembled with great

* "Nullo reprehensionibus modo imposito."—Ciacconius.

† "Hunc et posteris diebus, cessante jam metu, venerari ut pontificem perseverarunt. Sed fuit in illo homine natura inquieta et dura; et tunc præter spem ad tantæ dignitatis fastigium sublevatus intolerabilis videbatur. Nulla patribus gratia, quod se potissimum delegissent, nulla humanitas, nulla conciliatio animorum. Contumax, et minabundus, et asper malebat videri, et metui potius quam diligi. Ea perversitas Patres coegit metu et indignatione aliorum respicere. Itaque clam inter se de electione conquesti," &c.—Leonardus Aretinus, *Histor. Florent.*, lib. viii. ad finem. Leonardus was himself personally attached to the popes of that succession. By some the character of Urban is compared to that of Boniface VIII. Baluzius, the organ of the French opinion, represents him as a very monster—"Cujus electio facta arte diabolica."

‡ This learned and now influential body was courted with equal assiduity by Urban. In a letter addressed to it on this same occasion, that pontiff compared it to a constellation irradiating every other academy; to a fountain whence the purest doctrine perennially flowed; to a tree bearing excellent fruit. See Spondanus, *Ann.* 1378, a. xviii.

§ There exists a letter written during that crisis by Marsilius d'Inghen, ancient Rector of the University of Paris, who happened to be residing with Urban at that time. His description of affairs is such as we have given. See Fleury, l. 97, a. 52.

solemnity in the principal church, and promulgated, on the 9th of August, a public declaration, in the presence of many prelates and other ecclesiastics, by which the Archbishop of Bari was denounced an intruder into the pontificate, and his election formally cancelled*. They then retired, for greater security, to Fondi, in the kingdom of Naples. Still they did not venture to proceed to a new election in the absence, and it might be against the consent, of their Italian brethren. A negotiation was accordingly opened; and these last immediately fell into the snare, which treachery had prepared for ambition. To each of them separately a secret promise was made in writing, by the whole of their colleagues, that himself should be the object of their choice. Each of them believed what he wished; and concealing from each other their private expectations, they † pressed to Fondi with joy and confidence. The College immediately entered into conclave; and, as the French had, in the meantime, recoiled their provincial jealousies, Robert, the Cardinal of Geneva, was chosen by their unanimous vote. This event took place on the 20th of September (1378); the new pope assumed the name of Clement VII., and was installed with the customary ceremonies.

Robert of Geneva was of noble birth, and even allied to several of the sovereigns of Europe. He possessed talents and eloquence, a courage which was never daunted, and a resolution which was never diverted or wearied. Little scrupulous as to means, in his habits sumptuous and prodigal, he seemed the man most likely to establish his claims to a disputed crown, and to unite the courts of Christendom in his favour. His age, besides, which did not exceed thirty-six, gave promise of a vigorous and decisive policy.

Nevertheless, his first endeavours had very little success. It was in vain, that the sacred college sent forth its addresses to princes and their subjects, detailing all that had occurred at Rome, Anagni, and Fondi, and protesting against the violence, which occasioned the illegal election of Urban. It was argued, on the other hand, that the Cardinals had assisted at the subsequent ceremonies of enthronement and coronation; that they had announced their choice in the usual language to all the courts of Europe; that they had continued their personal attendance on the Pope for some weeks afterwards, and had even allowed four months to elapse, before they withdrew their obedience. Besides which, many, no doubt, were well pleased to see the chief of their church restored to his legitimate residence; they disliked the irregular influence of the French, and were glad to shake off their spiritual usurpation. In truth, the reasons, which were advanced with such ardour and obstinacy on both sides, were not perfectly conclusive for either; and though it is certain that the election was conducted under some degree of intimidation‡, the subsequent acqui-

* In this document, the cardinals, after describing the tumults of the Romans, declared, that they elected the Archbishop of Bari in the persuasion that, seeing the circumstances under which he was chosen, he would in conscience have refused the pontificate; that on the contrary, forgetful of his salvation, and burning with ambition, he consented to the choice; that under the effect of the same intimidation, he was enthroned and crowned, and assumed the name of pope, though he rather merited that of apostate and Antichrist. They then anathematized him as an usurper, and invoked against him all aids and succours, divine and human.

† They were now reduced to three, by the death of the Cardinal of St. Peter's.

‡ *Sismondi* (*Repub. Ital.*, ch. l.) does not consider the choice of the Cardinals to have been decided by the tumult of the people, because after all they did not elect a Roman, and therefore incurred some danger even by that compromise with their independence.

escence of the Cardinals makes it highly probable, that the legitimacy of Urban would never have been questioned, had he followed the usual course of pontifical misgovernment, or even published his schemes of reformation with less earnestness, or more discretion. The severity of his rebukes rankled in the conscience of those who deserved them; and his menaces persuaded the court, that, to preserve its beloved impurities, it must depose the master who presumed to arraign them. A Pope, so dangerous to the vices* of the powerful clergy, could not hope to maintain without dispute an ambiguous right.

Such was the origin of the schism which divided the Roman Church for about forty years, and accelerated more than any other event the decline of papal authority†. We have related the particulars with some minuteness, not only in justice to the importance of the subject, but also to show, that the great difficulties, which were soon afterwards found, even by impartial judges, in determining the rights of the competitors, were not without foundation; but that both parties had a plausible plea for their respective obedience, though the true policy and interests of the church clearly recommended an undivided adherence to the cause of Urban.

The hopes of Clement were fixed on the court of France; he knew that prejudices in his favour naturally existed in that kingdom, and he knew, too, that the first steps towards *France declares his general acknowledgment must be taken there. for Clement.* Charles V., affecting great impartiality, and admitting the deliberation due to so grave a question, convoked at Vincennes a grand Assembly of his clergy, nobles, and council. This august body, after individually abjuring the influence of all personal considerations, expressed an unanimous‡ conviction of the legitimacy of Clement. The

However, the real object of the populace was effected, if they obtained a Pope who would probably reside at Rome: *this*, and not the place of his nativity, was the point which touched their interests,—and the election of a Neapolitan secured it almost as certainly, as that of a Roman. Upon the whole, it seems most probable (and the result of the second election confirms this) that, had no external influence been exercised, the Cardinals would have chosen an *Ultramontane*, or, at any rate, not the Archbishop of Bari. Sismondi's eloquent description of this affair is chiefly drawn from the contemporary account of Thomas d'Acerno, Bishop of Lucera, who was present. On the other hand, Baldus, a celebrated lawyer and adherent of Urban, does not dispute the influence of the popular uproar, but rests the legitimacy of that Pope on the subsequent confirmation and obedience of the sacred college.

* He strictly forbade the Cardinals, on pain of excommunication, to accept any presents. He endeavoured to restrain the luxury of all his prelates, and even to reduce their tables to a single dish,—a laudable moderation, of which he set the example himself. Again, he threatened the French, that he would create so many Cardinals as to place them in a minority in the college. "Item Cardinales de Ursinis dixit quod erat unus Sotus." (Thomas d'Acerno, p. 725.) His harsh and offensive manner increased the unpopularity of his proposed reforms.

† The entire number of the schisms, which have disturbed the Roman Catholic Church, is variously estimated by its historians. *Johannes Marius*, a Belgian, historian of Louis XII., (a Latin translation of whose work is published, together with that of Theodoric of Niem,) makes the *fated* number to be twenty-four,—the last of which, the Schism of Anti-Christ, the most deadly of all, had not yet in his time befallen. The first in his catalogue is that of the Novatians; the sixteenth was that occasioned by Gregory VII.; the twentieth by Frederick Barbarossa; the twenty-second was that, which we are now describing. His Book is divided into three parts, of which the second, "De Conciliis Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ," contains some useful information.

‡ In a Council previously held (on Sept. 8), to examine the rights of the dispute between Urban and the French Cardinals, before the election of Robert of Geneva, the majority declared for the Cardinals, though they advised the king still to suspend his de-

king was guided by their voice, and declared on the 13th of November in his favour. The Queen of Naples, the city of Avignon, and the six Cardinals who resided there, had already come to the same determination. In the mean time, a passionate warfare of bulls and anathemas commenced on both sides; but happily the thunders must on this occasion have fallen harmless, even in the judgment of a moderate Catholic, since it was impossible certainly to decide which were the genuine bolts; and the ambiguous election of the rivals placed them both in the situation of Antipopes, rather than of Popes.

But they were not contented with those innocuous conflicts; the rights which were ineffectually asserted by ecclesiastical censures, appealed for protection to the sword: a succession of combats desolated the South of Italy, and ended in the discomfiture of Clement. His first refuge was Naples; but at length, finding it impossible to maintain himself in Italy against an Italian rival, he retired to the residence most suited to his fortunes and his prospects, Avignon. From a city which was already consecrated by the tombs of so many Popes, supported by the court and nourished by the clergy of France, he had defiance to his Transalpine adversary; and since he could not command, he was contented to divide, the spiritual obedience of Europe.

It does not enter into the plan of this History to pursue the affairs of the Church into all their connexions with political matters; to attend the march of papal armies, hateful alike in their reverses and their triumphs; or to trace the flimsy threads of intrigue, by which the momentary interests of Popes and kings have been suspended. It is enough to say, that, notwithstanding an intemperate ambition and some acts of singular imprudence, Urban continued to retain the greater part of his adherents. The

Division of Europe. Kings of Scotland and Cyprus, the Counts of Savoy and Geneva, the Duke of Austria, and some other

German princes, and even the Kings of Castille and Arragon, were finally united with France in allegiance to Clement. But the other states of Europe remained faithful to the vows, which they had earliest taken; and it was no unreasonable reply to the Antipope, Robert of Avignon, that he should be the last to reject that Pontiff, whom the Cardinal, Robert of Geneva, had officially recommended to universal obedience. The doctors and learned men of the age were similarly divided, and their division produced the most voluminous controversies. And lastly, as is observed by some Roman Catholic writers, many pious and gifted persons, who are now numbered among the saints of the Church, were to be found indifferently in either obedience; which sufficiently proved (they assert) that the eternal salvation of the faithful was not in this case endangered by their error. In this holy society, Catharine of Sienna was again conspicuous, as the advocate and adviser of the *Roman* Pope. She declared herself (says Maimbourg) loudly for Urban, and employed whatever talents, and eloquence, and force she possessed, in writing and exhorting all the world to acknowledge him. At the same time, in six epistles, which she addressed to himself, she discreetly recommended him to relax somewhat from that extreme austerity, which had made him so many enemies. To what extent Urban profited by that counsel we are scarcely able to decide, though some assert, that he held his holy monitress in much veneration. But we are credibly informed, that his predecessor, who had certainly been influenced by her

cision. Gibbon remarks, that it was the vanity, rather than the interest of the nation, which determined the court and clergy of France.

persuasions, when at length, on his death-bed, his stronger reason prevailed, called around him his friends and assistants, and solemnly cautioned them against all pretenders of either sex, who should propound their private revelations as rules of conduct and policy. 'Since I, (he said,) having been seduced by such as these, and having rejected the rational counsel of my friends, have dragged myself and the Church into the perils of a schism, which is now near at hand, unless Jesus, her Spouse, shall interpose in his mercy to avert it*.'

Such persons, notwithstanding, were found in abundance on both sides; and their wild visions were interpreted by the devotees of the day, and recorded by the grave historians of after times; and it was this, among other circumstances, which has seduced Roman Catholic writers to the very consoling conclusion, that, though a schism did unquestionably exist, yet there were none who could properly be termed schismatics; that the adherents of Urban and of Clement were equally the children of the church; and that, while the faithful differed as to the name of the bishop, they were united in unshaken allegiance and attachment to the See†.

Certainly the character of Urban was not permanently softened by the admonitions of his inspired instructress; and to many reported acts of harshness and rigour he presently added one of positive barbarity. The following story rests on satisfactory evidence. A plot for his deposition had been set on foot, originating, as it would seem, with the King of Naples; and a paper, which had been circulated with that object, was placed in the hands of some of his Cardinals—for Urban had immediately supplied the defection of his original court by a large and, for the most part, respectable creation. How far they countenanced the propositions contained in it does not certainly appear‡; but as by one of those the provisional government of the church was vested in the hands of the sacred college, it is not improbable that some may have assented to them. Urban discovered the conspiracy; he immediately seized six, the most suspected of the body, and after subjecting them to the utmost severity of torture, cast them into a narrow and noisome dungeon. This affair took place at Nocera, in the kingdom of Naples; but some reverses presently obliged the Pope to take refuge at Genoa. He carried his prisoners along with him in chains, and afflicted with severe hardships; and, during a year of sojourn in that civilised city, he could never be moved by the counsels of his friends, or the prayers of the republic which protected him, to re-

* "Ille positus in extremis, habens in manibus sacrum Christi Corpus, protestatus est coram omnibus, ut caverent ab hominibus, sive viris sive mulieribus sub specie religionis loquentibus visiones sui capitis; quia per tales ipse seductus, dimisso suorum rationabili consilio, se traxerat et ecclesiam in discrimen schismatis imminuentis, nisi misericors provideret sponsus Jesus." See Gerson, *De Examinatione Doctrinarum*, Pars ii., consid. iii.

† Never, says Maimbourg, was the unity of the See better preserved, than during this schism.

‡ Respecting some of the particulars of this affair we have the directly opposite evidence of two contemporaries, who had both excellent means of information. Gobellinus was attached to the house of Urban, and he relates, as the report which had reached him, that the Cardinals not only assented to the plan proposed to them, but actually suborned false witnesses to convict the Pope of heresy, and intended to burn him on the day of his condemnation,—and that this appeared from their own confessions. Theodoric of Niem, who was on the spot, and one of the judges appointed by the Pope to try the Cardinals, attests that all of them constantly asserted their innocence, excepting one only, who confessed, in the agony of the torture, anything that was asked him. Though neither author is free from the charge of partiality, we must here give our credence to the latter account, recollecting, that even that does not necessarily acquit the accused. Fleury (*l. xcviij., s. xx., xxi., &c.*), who relates the particulars of the torture from Theod. de Niem with painful minuteness, certainly believes the conspiracy.

lease his captives. At length, when on the point of departure, as he feared the inconvenience or the scandal of dragging them after him through a second journey, and as he could not exalt his resolution to the performance of an act of clemency, if, indeed, it were not justice, he consigned five of them to sudden and secret* execution. The other, an Englishman named Adam Eston, Bishop of London, owed his preservation only to the frequent and pressing remonstrances of the English King. This affair took place in the December of 1386.

In the October of 1389, Urban died at Rome; and as soon as the glad intelligence reached Avignon and Paris, great wishes were expressed and some hopes entertained in both places, that the schism would thus terminate; that the Cardinals of Rome, wearied by the labours, the vicissitudes, and the dangers of the conflict, would

Election and character of Boniface IX. voluntarily unite themselves with the college at Avignon, and acknowledge Clement for Pope, on the condition of his residence at Rome. In the

university especially the public lectures were suspended, and no subject was discussed, except the probable determination of the Roman Cardinals. In the mean time, that body, on whose resolution at that moment so much depended, appear not to have been embarrassed by any hesitation as to the course before them. The members immediately assembled, to the number of fourteen; they entered into conclave, and elected, within a fortnight from Urban's decease, another Neapolitan for his successor. Pietro or Perrino Tomacelli, Cardinal of Naples, assumed, on the second of November, the name of Boniface IX., and was placed on the throne for which his ignorance† alone was sufficient to disqualify him. But the scandal of his ignorance was enhanced by his avarice. On the year following his accession, a Jubilee‡ was held at Rome, and the devout were exhorted to present themselves from every quarter.

The Jubilee. Unmoved by distance and expense, and even by the personal dangers which awaited them from the partizans of Clement or the neutral bandits of the mountains, great multitudes undertook, and many accomplished, the pilgrimage. The altars of the Roman churches were again enriched by the contributions of superstition; and if some part of the offerings was expended in the repair of the sacred edifices, by far the larger proportion flowed directly into the coffers of the Pope. But Boniface was not contented with that partial stream, which had found its way to his capital; and being desirous, no doubt, that even those of his children, who had not listened to his call, should still participate in the spiritual consolation, he sent his emissaries among all the nations by whom he was acknowledged, with commissions to sell the plenary indulgence to all indiscriminately, for the same sum

* Most assert that he threw them into the sea in sacks; others affirm that they were strangled in prison, and their bodies consumed by quick-lime. It is certain that they disappeared.

† Theodoric of Niem, lib. ii., cap. vi., 'scribendi atque canendi imperitus: . . . Nemo prosperatur in illo quod ignorat; unde inscitia ferè venalis facta fuit in ipsa Curia, tempore suo. Fuit tamen satis edoctus grammaticæ ac disertus, sed non habuit in aliqua scientia præminentiam sive gradum.'

‡ The indication of this jubilee was the act of his predecessor. Urban VI., moved by the gradual abbreviation of human life, determined to reduce the interval (already reduced from 100 to 50) from 50 to 33 years,—this last space being the probable duration of Christ's sojourn on earth. See Spondanus, ann. 1389, s. ii. and iii. The new institution was to begin afresh from the year 1390; but it was not intended, as we shall presently observe, to supersede the secular celebration,

which the journey to Rome would have cost them. This absolution extended to every sort of offence, and appears not to have been preceded even by the ordinary formalities of confession or penance,—it was purely and undisguisedly venal. The necessary consequences of this measure were sufficiently demoralizing; but the evil was multiplied by the impostures of certain mendicants and others, who traversed the country with forged indulgences, which they bartered for their private profit.

Still dissatisfied, and determined to carry this lucrative mummery of the jubilee to its utmost depth, and, as it were, to fathom the superstitution of his age, Boniface communicated the privileges of the holy city to two towns of Germany—Cologne and Magdebourg; and permitted them also to hold their year of Jubilee, after the fashion and example of Rome. By this rash act he disparaged the supereminent sanctity of the see of St. Peter, of the tombs of the apostles, and the relics of so many martyrs! He called in question the exclusiveness of that glory, which was thought to encircle the throne of the Vicars of Christ! He sacrificed—that which he least intended to sacrifice—even the temporal interests, even the pecuniary profits, which were ever closely connected with the peculiar holiness of the apostolical city. But his immediate greediness was gratified; his collectors were present in both places to share the offerings of the faithful; and when he perceived that their satuity was not yet exhausted, he extended the licence still further, and accorded it to several insignificant places. At length, says Fleury, that Pope became so prodigal of his indulgences, that he refused them to no one, provided he was paid for them; the effect of which was, that they grew into contempt*.

In the mean time, the necessity of restoring the union of the church became more evident, and the expressions of that opinion more loud and general. Boniface himself professed an ardent though, as it proved, an insincere desire for the same consummation, and even addressed a letter to Charles of France (in April, 1393), in which he exhorted him seriously to undertake the sacred office of conciliation†. The king consented; the University of Paris eagerly caught at any hope of removing the scandal and the daily growing evils which attended it, and applied itself to discover the most efficient means. After mature deliberation, a public harangue was delivered before that body (in the June of 1394), by a doctor‡ appointed to the office, and after receiving their approbation, was presented to the king. It contained in substance, that there were three methods of healing the schism, any one of which might be adopted with reasonable hope of success:—the method of cession,—the method of compromise,—the method of a General Council. By the first the voluntary resignation of both competitors was recommended, in the presence of both colleges; these were then to proceed in conjunction to another election. By the second, the opposite claims might

*Projects of the
University of Paris.*

* The indulgence-mongers of Boniface IX., when they arrived in any city, suspended at their windows a flag, with the arms of the Pope and the keys of the Church. Then they prepared tables in the cathedral church, by the side of the altar, covered with rich cloths, like bankers', to receive the purchase-money. They then informed the people of the absolute power, with which the Pope had invested them, to deliver souls from purgatory, and give complete remission to all who bought their wares. If the German clergy exclaimed against this base traffic of spiritual favours, they were excommunicated. See Sismondi, *Repub. Ital.*, ch. lxii.

† It appeared, on subsequent explanation, that Boniface saw only one solution of the difficulty,—the expulsion of his rival, and the universal acknowledgment of himself.

‡ Nicholas de Clemangis.

be referred to certain arbitrators appointed by both parties, with the power of final decision. As to the third, it was suggested, in case of its adoption, that the Assembly should no longer consist of prelates only, many of whom were ignorant or passionately partial, but also of several doctors in theology and law, members of the most celebrated universities. Of the above methods, the University pronounced its own decided opinion in favour of the first,—as being the most prompt and expedient, the most proper to prevent expense and other difficulties, the most agreeable to the consciences of the faithful in both obediences, the most respectful to the honour of the princes, who had declared for the opposite parties. Yet was there an objection to this method, which, to many, as human nature is constituted, might have seemed at once conclusive against it:—was it probable, that, for the attainment of a public good, two men, in the enjoyment of very great power, dignity, and wealth, could both be persuaded to make a voluntary cession of those personal advantages, and to withdraw to a private, and perhaps insecure, retirement, from the loftiest eminence of ambition? Yet this difficulty does not appear to have been much considered in the outset, though it became manifest, even to the most sanguine, long before the termination of the contest.

In the same exposition, in which the remedies were thus pointed out, some of the monstrous evils which then afflicted the church were exhibited with little exaggeration; while all were naturally ascribed to the prevalent disease of the moment—the schism. It was forgotten that the greater number were rooted in the system itself, and only flourished somewhat more rankly on account of its accidental derangement. The church, it was declared, had fallen into servitude, poverty, and contempt. Unworthy and corrupt men, without the sense of justice or honesty, the servants of their intemperate passions, were commonly exalted to the prelacy; these plundered indifferently churches and monasteries, whatever was profane and whatever was sacred; and oppressed the inferior ministers of religion with intolerable exactions. The dominion of simony was universal; benefices and cures were conferred only on those, who had means to buy them; while the poor and learned candidate was hated the more for that very learning, which made him dangerous to corruption. And not only were the dignities of the church publicly bartered; not only were relics and crosses and the sacred vessels commonly exposed to sale; but the very sacraments themselves, those especially of ordination and penance, had their price in gold.

A political circumstance occurred at this moment which was favourable to the hopes of union. A truce for four years was signed between the kings of England and France—the most zealous supporters of the opposite parties. At the same time, the University of Cologne, though it acknowledged Boniface, and had probably profited by his patronage, entered into correspondence with that of Paris for the extinction of the schism;—and lastly, as if to place the result within the immediate reach of the pacificators, Clement VII. was so violently* affected by the proceedings at Paris, that he was struck with apoplexy, and died.

As soon as this intelligence reached Paris, the deputation from the

* When the earnest and reasonable exhortations of the University were pressed upon him—when he was assured that the evil had gone so far, that some began almost to advocate a *plurality* of popes, and the appointment of one to every kingdom—the infatuated bigot only started from his seat in anger, and declared that ‘the letters were poisoned, and tended to bring the Holy See into discredit.’

university instantly petitioned the king, that he would cause the cardinals to suspend the election, until some general measures should be taken to ensure the union; also, that he would assemble his prelates and nobles, and order processions and public prayers to the same end throughout his kingdom. Accordingly, a royal messenger was dispatched to Avignon, to prevent the meeting of the College, and prepare it for a special embassy; and on the success of this mission hung the hopes of Christendom. The envoy arrived at Avignon only ten days after the decease of Clement; but he found the cardinals already in conclave! Still, as the election was not yet made, he transmitted to them the letter of the king; but the College, suspecting its contents, and determined at any risk to have a pope of their own creation, deferred the opening of the letter, till their actual business should be completed. They then hastened to a decision; and Peter of Luna, Cardinal of Arragon, was raised by their unanimous voice to the divided throne.

Howbeit, they previously took a precaution, which was certainly necessary for their own credit, though there were few, probably, who expected any real advantage from *Election of Peter of Luna, Benedict XIII.* Before the election they drew up an act, by which they solemnly engaged to labour for the extinction of the schism, and to give every aid to the future pope for that purpose. It was moreover specified, that if any one among themselves should be raised to the pontificate, this act should be equally binding upon him; and that he should even be prepared to cede his dignity, if his cardinals should judge it expedient for the concord of the Church. They then took oaths on the altar to observe this engagement.

Peter of Luna had long been distinguished for ability and address; he had discharged with vigour the offices entrusted to him; but there was also an opinion respecting him, which seems more than any other to have procured his elevation, and even at first to have reconciled all parties to it,—this was, that he ardently desired the union of the Church. This zeal he had been forward, while cardinal, to proclaim upon all occasions—even so far as to censure Clement for the want of it; and many hoped that it would burn with equal fervour under the pontifical robes. The University addressed to him congratulations, which were seemingly sincere, and Benedict XIII. (the name assumed by him) repaid them with the strongest protestations of good intention.

A grand council was then held at Paris, in which the method of cession again received the approbation of the great majority; and it was agreed, that an embassy should be sent to Avignon to treat with the Pope. The king added his authority, to give weight to this measure; and the more certainly to secure its success, he sent his brother and both his uncles (the Dukes of Burgundy and Berri) to conduct the negociation. Benedict received them with respect and deference; but when they opened the subject of their mission, and pressed the necessity of the cession, as the only road to concord, he found many reasons to urge against that particular method, as indeed against the other two, which had also occurred to the university. In the place of them, he proposed a conference with his rival, at which he affected to believe that matters might be accommodated. The ambassadors persevered in their proposal; and even the cardinals, on their strong solicitation, declared, with one exception*, for the method of cession. Nevertheless Benedict, during several weeks of repeated conferences and

* The Cardinal Bishop of Pampeluna, a Spaniard and compatriot of the Pope.

debates, inflexibly persisted in his refusal. At length the illustrious mission returned to Paris, without any other result than, the discovery of Benedict's insincerity.

Notwithstanding this failure, the king addressed himself very warmly, to unite the different courts and learned bodies of Europe in favour of the method, which still seemed to promise the greatest hopes. Messengers traversed the country in all directions, and every state and every city in Europe was agitated by the same momentous question. The speculations of the learned and the projects of the powerful were equally engrossed by it; and it seemed as if the fate of all governments, and the welfare of all subjects, depended on its solution. At this time the University of Paris, which took the foremost part in these discussions, and possessed much more influence than any other learned body, openly expressed dissatisfaction with Benedict, and even threw out some menaces of a general council, in case of his further contumacy.

- Benedict watched these proceedings with anxiety; but the variety and discordance of the materials, which it was necessary to combine for his destruction, gave him the confidence to persist;—upon which the Doctors of Paris advanced one degree towards more efficient measures. And as Luna had unreservedly sworn to adopt the method of cession, in case his cardinals should hereafter recommend it, and as his cardinals had strongly recommended it, and as he had then unequivocally rejected it, little sympathy could be expected from any quarter with a prelate, whose selfish opposition to the interests of religion was made more detestable by an act of deliberate perjury. The measure was, to draw up a strong exposition of Benedict's general delinquency, and of the particular grievances of the complainants, and to appeal from his censures, whether past or future, to the future pope*: a step which very temperately opened the path for more vigorous proceedings.

In the meantime, the courts which acknowledged the rival pope made great exertions to bring him to the arrangement—
Conduct of Boniface. which to them seemed so reasonable, and to him so unjust and extravagant. From Sicily to the extremities of Germany assemblies were held and resolutions adopted; and the vows, and talents, and energies of all men were directed to the same object; consequently, deputations and embassies were sent to Rome from all quarters. Boniface at first was contented to reply, that he was the true and only Pope, and that universal obedience was due to him; but presently, in the year 1398, when the emperor at length interfered more directly, and pressed the method of cession, he found it expedient to dissemble; and, by the advice of his cardinals, he promised submission, provided (a very safe proviso) that the Antipope of Avignon should also resign his claims†. Yet, even so guarded a concession alarmed the avaricious fears of the citizens of Rome. They trembled lest their bishop and his prodigal court, and the train of his dependents, and expectants, and sycophants, should again be seduced to some foreign residence. That event, too, at that moment, would have been peculiarly afflicting, since in two years (in 1400) the second grand and general Jubilee was to take place; and the inhabitants had already begun to make provision for the season of spoliation. Accordingly, a body of the notables of the city waited upon the Pope, and professed towards him the most sincere and

* On this occasion numbers of polemical tracts and pamphlets were published on both sides, containing, as Fleury has observed, many words but few reasons.

† Spondanus, ann. 1398, s. ii.

unprecedented * affection: they declared that they would never desert him, but sustain, with their very lives and property, his just and holy cause. 'My children,' replied Boniface, 'take courage! rest assured that I will continue to be pope; and whatever I may say, or however I may play off the King of France and the Emperor against each other, I will never submit to their will.'

While such was the disposition of the Roman competitor, during the July of the same year the Court and University of Paris at length perceiving that a *Subtraction of obedience*, mere contest of acts and declarations would never weary the Pontiff of Avignon, proceeded to a measure of greater efficacy—one which no Catholic nation had hitherto, on any occasion, dared to adopt against any pope:—'By the aid and advice of the princes and other nobles, and of the Church of our kingdom, as well clergy as people, we entirely withdraw our obedience from Pope Benedict XIII., as well as from his adversary, whom indeed we have never acknowledged. And we ordain, that no one henceforward make any payment to Pope Benedict, his collectors, or agents, from the ecclesiastical revenues or emoluments. We also strictly prohibit all our subjects from offering to him any manner of obedience.' Such was the substance of the royal proclamation; and arrangements were at the same time made to deprive the pope of the presentation to all benefices, for as long a time as it should remain in force. This edict was received with such general respect and submission, that the very domestics and chaplains of Benedict retired from their offices; and what was still more important, the cardinals themselves withdrew in a body from his court. But he, nothing moved by that unanimity, was the more forward on repeated occasions to assert, that he was the true and genuine pope; that he would remain so, in despite of king, duke, or court—and that he was prepared to renounce his life, rather than his dignity.

Recourse was then had to the only method which gave any just hope of success. A military force was sent against Avignon; and as the inhabitants of that city also declared their adhesion to the king and the cardinals, nothing now remained in opposition to the royal will and the force of the nation, except the pontifical palace. But Benedict had secured some faithful mercenaries for its defence; and an effective blockade was thought sufficient for the objects of his enemies. Thus for the space of four years he continued a close prisoner in his own residence, without any strength to resist the means employed against him, or any disposition to yield to them. But at length, the vigour of that powerful confederacy was dissipated by the persevering intrigues of one feeble individual, and the variety of interests and principles in the mass opposed to Benedict led by slow degrees to a disunion, which preserved him. The first, who betrayed his party was a Norman officer, Robinet de Braquemont,—who, through the confidence reposed in him, and his constant access to the palace, found easy means of liberating the pope. It was on March 12, 1403, that the successor of St. Peter concealed his apostolical sanctity under the disguise of a menial; and, having thus eluded the penetration of his guards, took refuge in a small town near Avignon. As a pope was never wont to travel, unless preceded by the

* Fleury, liv. xcix. s. 18. Boniface artfully availed himself of this unusual display of loyalty on the part of his subjects to secure an extent of temporal authority over them, such as no former pope is said to have possessed. See Ægidius Card. Viterb. apud Pag. Vit. Bonif. IX. s. xliii.

Holy Sacrament, Benedict carried out with him a little box, containing the consecrated element; and even, for the literal observance of that custom, he placed the box upon his breast.

As soon as he found himself in safety, he caused his beard, which he had nourished during the persecution of his captivity, to be shaved off; and recovering with his freedom the consciousness of his dignity, he resumed the habits and authority of a pope. No sooner was the circumstance of his liberation made known, than several noble individuals rendered to him the accustomed homage. Immediately the College of Cardinals passed over to him and sought a reconciliation. The citizens of Avignon eagerly tendered their offers of service. Benedict forgave the truancy, and accepted the repentance of all. At the same time, the party in France, which for some time had been opposed to the *subtraction** of obedience, and which had lately gained strength, now boldly declared its adhesion. The king was privately induced to join it; and, notwithstanding the resistance of the more consistent promoters of ecclesiastical concord, it prevailed. By an edict of May 30, an entire and unequivocal restitution of obedience was enjoined: thus after a partial interruption of about five years, the tide of papacy resumed for a season, even in France itself, its prescribed and customary † course.

The reason which was advanced by the king, to justify so complete a change in his policy, was, that the example of France had not been followed by other nations ‡; and that, while the pontiff of Avignon was confined to his palace walls, the intruder at Rome was acquiring new strength and confidence. We shall, therefore, now recur very briefly to the system of government which Boniface had adopted. It appears to have been directed by one principle only—to extract the largest possible sums from the superstition of the people and the ambition of the clergy, and the folly and credulity of both. During the first seven years of his pontificate, his proceedings were veiled by some show of decency, through a reluctant respect which he paid to the virtues of some of the ancient cardinals. But as these successively died, and were replaced by others of his own creation and character, he broke out into the undisguised practice of simony §. This was the most copious and constant source of his

* It is the word used by ecclesiastical writers—*Subtractio*, *soustraction*.

† The first proof of moderation and gratitude which Benedict gave after the Act of Restitution was, to appoint afresh to certain benefices, which had been filled up during the subtraction. The king then sent an embassy to *pray* him to confirm such provisions, as had been then made. *He returned a direct refusal*. On this, Charles published his commands, that those who had been so appointed should, at any rate and without any fees to the Pope, remain in possession. This was conclusive.

‡ In 1399, King Richard expressly consulted the University of Oxford on the grand question of the age. The answer of that body was very decided against any refusal of obedience to Boniface, *because he was indeed the true Pope*. On the same ground, they objected to the method of cession, and insisted in preference on that of a General Council—to be convoked of course by their own genuine Pope. Thus they assumed at once the point at issue—if Boniface had power to convoke a council of universal authority, Boniface was truly Pope—and the schism was at an end.

§ See Theodoric of Niem, *De Schismat.*, lib. ii., cap. vii., viii., ix., x., xi., xii., &c. This author, a native of Westphalia, was attached as Secretary to the Roman Court during the whole of the Schism; and besides the History of this Event, in four books, (the last of which is entitled *Nemus Unionis*) he composed the Life of John XXIII. He exposed pontifical depravity with freedom, it may be with rancour. Spondanus (ann. 1404, s. xvi.) especially ascribes his account of the simony of Boniface to an *ulcerosus stomachus*, and of course other Roman Catholic writers are scandalized by his little reserve. But we doubt not, that his narrative is essentially true.

gains; but when the simple and honest sale of benefices proved insufficient for his demands, he had recourse, besides, to direct acts of fraud and robbery. In the distribution of graces and expectatives, the poorest candidates were invariably placed at the bottom of the list; but this was not sufficient—even the promises, that had been made them, were frequently cancelled in favour of some wealthier competitor, to whose more recent patent an earlier date was affixed, with a clause of preference. The fluctuating health and approaching decease of an opulent incumbent were watched with impatient anxiety, and appointed couriers hurried to Rome with the welcome intelligence. Immediately the benefice was in the market; and it not uncommonly happened, that the same was sold as vacant to several rivals, even under the same date. The ravages of a frightful pestilence only contributed to fill the pontifical coffers: and a benefice was sometimes sold in the course of a few weeks to several successive candidates, of whom none survived to take possession. At length, in the year 1401, the pontiff proceeded so far, as to cancel by a single act nearly all the graces, dispensations and expectatives which he had previously granted, and to declare them wholly void—that he might enter afresh and without any restraints upon the task, which seemed almost to be terminated, and reap from the same exhausted soil a second harvest of shame and iniquity. By such methods* Boniface enriched himself, and impoverished his clergy; and however we may abominate his rapacity, we have little cause to feel any compassion for the sufferers; who were possibly influenced by the same passion, and who were certainly involved in the same simoniacal scandal with himself.

The superstition of the laity was also taxed to the utmost point of endurance; the excessive abuse of the Jubilee has been mentioned as the favourite resource of Boniface, and the circumstances of the time combined to sharpen his appetite for that feast. The year 1400 was that destined, according to the original institution of Boniface VIII., for the celebration of the *secular* solemnity; and it appears that, though the innovations of later popes had met with very general reverence, there were still several rigid devotees who, holding them in inferior estimation, looked forward with pious impatience to the approach of the legitimate festival. Neither was this impression confined to the nations in the obedience of the Roman competitor; the followers of Benedict acknowledged by their respect for the apostolical city the authority of the See, though they rejected the usurper who occupied it; and the French especially pressed in great multitudes to obtain the plenary indulgence at Rome. Charles published an ordonnance to restrain the emigration of his subjects; he saw with sorrow, not perhaps their slavish superstition, but the exportation of their wealth to a foreign and even hostile treasury. Still in many, the religious zeal overpowered the sense of civil duty, and these proceeded on their pilgrimage. But several were intercepted and pillaged on their road by partisans at enmity with the Pope; and those, who escaped

Spodanus excuses the rapacity of Boniface by his necessities, and brings some authority for the assertion, *that he died poor*.

* The system of Annates, or the payment of a year's first fruits to the Apostolical Chamber, was brought to perfection by Boniface IX. It did not, however, originate with him; Clement V. having learnt that some bishops in England exacted such claims from their diocesan clergy, felt justified in transferring the right to the See of Rome. This took place in 1306; thirteen years afterwards, John XXII., when he reserved for *three years* the first fruits of all vacant benefices, excepted the bishoprics and abbeys. Boniface IX. extended the usurpation to the prelacies, and *made it perpetual*. Fleury, l. xcix. s. xxvii. Spodanus, ann. 1339, s. ii.

this danger, were exposed, on the termination of their journey, to the pestilence which was laying waste the holy city. Some perished miserably; and others, whose resources were exhausted through their devotion and their sufferings, when they applied for aid to the apostolical coffers, were dismissed with a cold and contemptuous refusal.

Four years afterwards Boniface died; his cardinals immediately entered into conclave, and elected a successor, nearly under the same conditions which had been accepted and violated by Benedict. He assumed the name of Innocent VII.; but the

Innocent VII. succeeds Boniface.

two years of his imbecile government produced no other change, than the secession of Genoa and Pisa to the obedience of his rival. Both parties expressed equal desire for the extinction of the schism; both were equally insincere; and the attention of the courts of Christendom and the feelings of the pious friends of the Church, were insulted by the verbose correspondence and recriminations of two aged hypocrites. Innocent died in 1406; and the Roman cardinals then seriously deliberated on the expediency of deferring the new election, until some measures could be taken in concert with the college at Avignon.

But their fears of an interested populace contended with their wisdom and their virtue; they likewise dreaded the risks, which the temporal sovereignty of the See must incur during the interregnum—their indecision terminated in a half-measure. They bound themselves by oath, that whichever of them should be chosen, should hold himself in perpetual readiness to resign, in case the concord of the Church and the union of the two Colleges should require

Election of Angelo Corrario, or Gregory XII.

it; and that he should immediately make public, that such was the condition of his election. This act having been assented to with great solemnity, they threw their eyes upon a prelate, whose advanced age, whose holy reputation*, whose habitual integrity, whose ardent love of the Church and regard for its best interests, placed him beyond all suspicion, almost beyond the possibility, of perfidy. Angelo Corrario, a Venetian, the titular patriarch of Constantinople, was the character which they sought. Seventy years of immaculate piety, by which he was endeared to the whole Church, were a pledge for the extinction of any selfish passions, which at any time might have lurked in his bosom; and the austerity of his devotion, which emulated the holiness of the antient pontiffs, guaranteed the strict observance of his engagement. Accordingly, on the instant of his election, he eagerly ratified his covenant†, and proclaimed his intention to restore union to the

* They sought not (says Aretinus) for a man of business or address, but for one of honour and integrity; and at length they unanimously fixed their choice upon Angelo Corrario, "virum prisca severitate et sanctimonia reverendum."

† The short account of Leonardus Aretinus, the attendant and faithful adherent of Angelo, should be cited. "Is conclavi egressus promissionem, votum, et juramentum, quæ privatus fecerat, tunc in potestate constitutus iterato novavit. Atque ita loquebatur de Unione primo illo tempore, ut, si cætera deessent, *pedibus et baculo se iturum ad eam conficiendam asseveraret.* Statimque adversario scripsit benigne illum ad pacem invitans et abdicacionem mutuam offerens. Adversarius autem *tantisdem ferme syllabis* ad eum rescripsit; eadem invitatio fuit, eademque cohortatio. . . Locus deinde necessarius visus est in quo et Pontifices ipsi et collegia convenirent. Ad hoc Savona pari consensu recepta est. . . Prosperè huc usque et plane ex sententia. Deinde paulatim res labascere cepit et cuncta indies deteriora fieri. Voluntas autem illa Pontificis recta nequaquam satis habere firmitatis reperta est ad pontificatum deponendum; cujus rei culpam multi in

Church by any risk or sacrifice. Should it be necessary to perform the journey on foot with his staff in his hand, or to encounter the sea in the most wretched bark, he vowed that he would still present himself at the place of conference. His declarations were received with joy and confidence, and it was thought that the flock of Christ had at length obtained a faithful shepherd.

After his restoration to liberty, the policy of Benedict had entirely changed—all his original desire for the extinction of the schism appeared to be revived; he had made overtures to that effect both to Boniface and Innocent; and when the new Pope (Gregory XII.) addressed him on the subject, he renewed his usual protestations. But they were no longer able to deceive either the court or the doctors of Paris: it was found that, however profuse in general professions, he invariably evaded the cession, whenever it was strongly recommended to him; and he was not the better loved for the frequent exactions of tenths and annates, to which his necessities even more than his avarice obliged him.

At length it was arranged, at a meeting of certain deputies of both parties, that the long-promised conference should be brought about; and the place selected for the purpose was Savona. Some hopes were entertained from this project, and it was pressed with earnestness both at Rome and Avignon. The time was fixed for the Michaelmas of 1407; and when it arrived, Benedict was found at the appointed city, full of his customary declarations. But where was Angelo Corrarior, the sworn advocate of concord, the model of antient holiness? Every solicitation, to observe the direct obligation of his oath, had been urged upon him in vain. To the most overpowering arguments he opposed the most contemptible pretexts. He was secretly determined to evade the conference; and he did finally absent himself. Then followed another interchange of accusations and protestations, which had no other effect than to persuade men, that an understanding secretly subsisted between the two Pretenders, and that they had conspired to cajole the world and retain their offices by their common perjury*.

We shall not pursue the tedious details of their elaborate duplicity; nor is it important to notice the multifarious correspondence which perplexed the dispute, nor even closely to trace the circumstances, which led to its conclusion†. It is enough to mention the leading facts. In the first place, in contempt of one important clause‡ of the oath taken in

propinquos ejus referebant, &c. . . . Erat in altero Pontifice non melior sane mens, sed occultabat callidius malam voluntatem, et quia noster fugiebat, ipse obviam ire videbatur. . . . Sed cum de congressu eorum per internuntios ageretur, noster tanquam terrestre animal ad litus accedere, ille tanquam aquaticum a mari discedere recusabat . . . Cum per hunc modum desideria Christianorum qui pacem unitatemque optabant in longum ducerentur, non tulerunt Cardinales nostri, sed deserto Pontifice Pisas abiere," &c. Leonard Aretin. in *Rer. Italicar. Historia*. "Ego (the historian presently continues) Pontificem secutus sum potius familiaritatis gratia, quam quod ejus causam probarem. Quanquam fuit in Gregorio permagna vitæ morumque honestas et prisca quædam, ut ita dixerim, bonitas, scripturarum quoque scientia et indagatio subtilis et recta" . . . Denique in cunctis fermè rebus mihi satisfaciebat, præterquam in Unionis negotio . . . Id. loc. cit. Gibbon has referred to this passage in his 70th Chapter.

* Spondanus, ann. 1408, s. v.

† The celebrated embassy sent from France both to Rome and Avignon, just before the Council of Pisa, is described by Gibbon, chap. lxx.

‡ "That both parties shall promise to make no new cardinals during the treaty of union." Gregory probably considered this part of the obligation as conditional. And, as it is not likely that Benedict should have made any such promise, he might feel that the engagement was not binding upon himself. . . . Had he been more scrupulous, when

conclave, Gregory created four new cardinals; on which the others, in just indignation, deserted his court and retired to Pisa, where they fixed their residence. Presently afterwards (in 1408) the King of France took measures to seize the person of Benedict; but that accomplished politician, having constantly retained a small fleet in his service on the plea of personal security, set sail on the rumour of this danger, and, after a short cruise on the coast of Italy, found a safer refuge at Perpignan in Spain,—for the Spaniards continued to adhere to their countryman through all his vicissitudes, and through all his perfidy. At Perpignan he assembled his bishops, and held his councils, and awaited the termination of the tempest.

But his cardinals remained in France; and now perceiving that they were abandoned by their master, they turned their attention more zealously than before to the extinction of the schism. To that end, they negotiated in perfect sincerity with the rival college at Pisa; and the consequence was an immediate coalition. By this event, the first substantial ground towards the closing of the schism was gained. It was now clearly ascertained, that the voluntary cession of the pretenders, under any conceivable circumstances, was hopeless. The latest proof of that truth was the strongest; since Angelo di Corrario, the most unblemished of mankind, had chosen to stain his grey hairs with deliberate perjury, rather than resign the possession—the very short possession—of a disturbed and disputed dignity. No resource henceforward remained, except compulsion; and the union of the colleges afforded the only prospect of that result. Some difficulties were still to be overcome, but the convocation of a General Council promised to remove them. Accordingly the Council was summoned to assemble at Pisa in the March of 1409.

The Council of Pisa met under circumstances wholly different from any other similar assembly. In the division of churchmen it represented the unity of the Church. Disregarding the opposite pretensions to individual legitimacy, it asserted the undivided authority of the See; and thus, since there might be many antipopes, but not possibly more than one pope, the object to which its proceedings necessarily tended, was to reject the two actual claimants, and substitute one true and catholic pontiff. It was summoned by the cardinals, twenty-four of whom were present, and it was attended by a great number of prelates*, as well as by the generals of the Mendicant orders, and the deputies of several universities. Ambassadors from the courts of Germany, France, England, and others, were likewise present; though the object of the first was rather to question the legitimacy, than to sanction the deliberations, of the council. The scruples of these envoys gave rise to an important discussion, which was occasionally renewed afterwards; and which, as far as the principles of the disputants were concerned, divided the High Papist party from the moderate Catholics. It was argued on the one side, from the language of the canons and the unvarying practice of the Church, that a general Council could not legally assemble, unless by the authority and express summons of the Pope, whereas the meeting at

the obligation was direct and unequivocal, we might have given him the benefit of this supposition.

* Besides the three patriarchs, 180 archbishops and bishops, and about 300 abbots, were present in person or by representatives, and 282 doctors in theology.—Spondanus, ann. 1409, s. ii.

Pisa had received the sanction of no pontiff. On the other hand, it was maintained, that no pope did then in fact exist; that both pretenders, by their long-continued perfidy and contumacy, had involved themselves in the guilt of schism and heresy,*; and that, under such circumstances, if the necessities of the Church demanded it, the cardinals had full power to call a council †. Recollecting, as we do, the false foundation on which the claims of the pope really rested, we can scarcely pretend to doubt on which side the reason lay. But among the controversialists of that time, the spuriousness of the Decretals was still unknown, and almost unsuspected; and pretensions directly derived from them were acknowledged with respectful acquiescence.

The Council then proceeded to fulfil its object. The first step was, to summon the pretenders to appear in person or by deputy, and on their non-appearance, to pronounce them contumacious. The next, to trace the proofs of their insincerity and collusion, and to expose their perjury. The next, to command the Christian world to withdraw its obedience from the one and from *and elect Alexander V.* the other. Then followed the sentence of condemnation;—and here we may pause to remark, that the prelate, who pronounced it, was the titular Patriarch of Alexandria, supported on either hand by those of Antioch and Jerusalem. The two schismatics, after a long enumeration of their crimes, were cut off from the Church; and the Holy See was declared vacant. Then the cardinals, after binding themselves by oath to continue the Council after the election, for the general purposes of church reform, entered into conclave. They remained six days in deliberation; and their choice fell upon the Cardinal of Milan, Peter of Candia, who took the name of Alexander V.

Peter, native of Candia, a Venetian subject, had risen from so low an origin, that he professed to retain no recollection of his parentage—a circumstance (he boasted) which gave him a great advantage over his predecessors, since it exempted him from all temptation to nepotism ‡. One day, as he was begging alms, while yet extremely young, an Italian monk took compassion on him, and introduced him into his convent. From Candia, as he gave great promise of intellectual attainment, he was carried into Italy; and thence, for the gradual completion of his studies, to the universities, first of Oxford, and afterwards of Paris. There he acquired great theological reputation, and retained along with it a mild, liberal, and convivial disposition. He was already advanced in age when raised to the pontificate. . . . After a few more sessions, in which a commission was appointed for the investigation of ecclesiastical abuses, and some unimportant regulations enacted, the Council was adjourned for an interval of three years, till the April of 1412.

The authority of the Council of Pisa was recognised by all the national churches of Europe, excepting Arragon, Castille, Bavaria, and Scotland; and Rome itself, by placing Alexander in the list of its genuine bishops, has offered it the same acknowledgment. Its proceedings were conducted without any reproach of irregularity or dissension, and it dis-

* This last assertion does not appear, at first sight, so obvious—but the word heresy was now used in a much more comprehensive sense, than in the early church:—perseverance in schism was at this time sufficient to constitute heresy.

† That there were cases, in which they possessed that right, does not appear to have been disputed—that, for instance, of the insanity of a pope.

‡ It was the boast of his friends, that, from being a rich archbishop, he had become a poor cardinal; and that the popedom had reduced him to beggary.

persed under the auspices of a legitimate pope. It remains to inquire, what was the effect produced upon the antipopes by decisions so solemnly delivered. On the determination of an assembly, which expressed the power and united the vows of almost every nation of Europe, what course did the repudiated schismatics adopt? Did they endeavour to conciliate the party, which they were too weak to resist, and too infamous longer to cajole? Did they resign those claims, by which they might still indeed disturb the peace of Christendom, but which could scarcely promise any substantial dignity to themselves?—No;—they clung to the fragments of their fortunes with the same attachment, which had bound them to prosperity; and the more generally it was admitted, that *both* were pretenders and antipopes, the more violently each proclaimed himself to be the genuine pope. Benedict could still boast of the obedience of Spain; but this was a narrow field to content the ambition of the successor of the Gregories and the Innocents. But the reverses of his rival were even more remarkable. He only escaped captivity by traversing the ambush of his enemies in the disguise of a merchant; while his chamberlain, who resembled him in person, and had assumed his robes, was taken in his place, and subjected to some severity of treatment. Having in such guise escaped to two galleys which awaited him, and which conveyed him to Gaeta, he then reclaimed his dignity, and imitated, with his scanty train of courtiers, the pomp of the imperial city. He was protected, indeed, by Ladislaus, and neither Germany nor Hungary had yet nominally withdrawn from his obedience. But he was poor, and as he had no patronage, he had no resources; and his few followers continued to adhere to him through fear of the King of Naples, rather than from any attachment either to his person, or his cause.

Alexander V., the feebleness of whose character made him liable to the influence of any more vigorous spirit, fell almost entirely under the guidance of a Neapolitan, named Baltazar Cossa, Legate at Bologna. This extraordinary person, by birth a nobleman, by habit and inclination a soldier, by profession a churchman, and in rank a cardinal, was one of the boldest champions of the Council of Pisa. And when it appeared that the possession of Rome could only be recovered from Ladislaus by military measures, Baltazar undertook to conduct an expedition for that purpose. The Roman people acknowledged the authority of Alexander, and sent to him a deputation with the keys of the city. The Pope was then at Bologna. He received the envoys with magnificence; he expressed his pleasure at their emancipation from the seductions of Angelo Corrario; and in respect to the desire, which they testified, to have their Pope among them, and to receive the Jubilee*, (for these vows were united in their petition,) he appointed the year 1413 for that solemnity. This circumstance is worthy of thus much attention, as it shows how unblushingly the Romans at that time avowed the real motive of their attachment to the Vicar of Christ; and also, how basely a Pope, who could not plead either weakness or poverty, pandered to their cupidity. But Alexander V. was not destined to witness the execution of his decree, nor even to receive the venal applauses of his people. He died at Bologna the year after his election (May 3d, 1410), and the cardinals, after a very short deliberation, appointed Baltasar Cossa in his place.

The world was surprised at this election; for though he possessed good natural talents, and a rapid decision in matters of business and other tem-

* Fleury, l. c. sec. xliii.

poral concerns, Baltazar was of a violent temper, and remarkable for the licentiousness of his morals; his demeanour and manners corresponded with his reputation; and the military air, which so little became the habit of the cardinal, seemed wholly to disqualify him for the chair of St. Peter. On the other hand, his fearless character gave promise of that vigour, which was now required for the restoration of the Church; and it was hoped, that, if he did not awaken to the spiritual duties of his station, he would at least consent to observe its decencies.

John XXIII. (Baltazar assumed that name) did not at first deceive either of those expectations; his manners were softened on his elevation, and his morals ostensibly amended; and he framed his political arrangements so well, that the king of Naples declared in his favour. Then Gregory, for the second time an exile, embarked his person and his suite in two trading vessels, and sought almost the only spot in Europe which continued to obey him. Charles Malatesta opened to him the gates of Rimini; and there, together with three cardinals who still followed him, he had space to deplore the passion or the weakness, through which he had exchanged a holy reputation and dignified independence for banishment, insecurity, and infamy.

The death of the emperor at this moment opened an occasion to the Pope to recommend Sigismond as successor; and as Sigismond was actually chosen, a friendly inter-*and of Sigismond*
course was immediately established between the two *to the Empire.*
parties. The still disturbed condition of the Church, and the abuses which universally prevailed, demanded indeed their cordial and honest co-operation; and in this at least they agreed, that a General Council was the only remaining remedy, and that no time should be lost in convoking it. On the dissolution of that of Pisa, it had been arranged that another should be called after three years. Accordingly, John had summoned the prelates to Rome at the appointed time; but so few presented themselves, that it was not judged expedient to proceed to any important enactments.

The place, which was now selected for a more efficient meeting, was the city of Constance, in Switzerland. Much depended on that selection. Much depended on the local influence which might probably be exercised, and which would certainly affect the deliberations of the body. Constance was under the direct control of Sigismond; and it is well known *

* Leonardus Aretinus relates a curious anecdote on this subject, which throws light on the still disputed character of John. "The pontiff privately communicated to me his design. The whole matter (said he) depends on the place of the council, and I will not have it where the emperor is the stronger. I shall therefore give to the legates, whom I send to decide this matter, credentials of full power and discretion for public appearance's sake, but I shall privately restrict them to certain specified places—and then he mentioned those places. Afterwards, when the legates came to take leave, having dismissed all excepting myself, he secretly addressed them and showed of what weight the matter was, on which they were sent. Then, speaking kindly to them, he praised their prudence and fidelity, and said that they knew what ought to be done better than himself. While he was thus talking and repeating those civil things to them, he was himself overpowered by a feeling of kindness, and in an instant changed the design so long determined by him. I had meant, he said, to give you a list of certain places, from which list you should on no account depart; but at this very instant I change my mind, and commit every thing to your prudence. It is for you to think, what may be safe and what dangerous for me. And thus he tore in pieces the paper, on which he had written the names of the places. The legates therefore going to Sigismond chose Constance—a transalpine city and subject to the emperor. When John heard this, he was incredibly affected, and lamented his

that the Pope foresaw some of the consequences of that arrangement, and consented to it with extreme reluctance. It is

Convocation of the Council of Constance. known too, that he felt a much stronger inclination to march in arms for the recovery of his capital, which the death of Ladislaus had again opened to him, than to conduct the peaceful procession of his cardinals towards the appointed city. Nevertheless, his outward conduct betrayed no disposition to recede, whatever may have been his private wishes or his secret intrigues; and having fixed the first of November, 1414, for the opening of the Council, he was present for the performance of his duties on that day.

The situation of Constance in many particulars justified the preference, which the emperor had obtained for it. Its pleasant and healthful situation on the shores of an extensive lake; its central position with respect to France, Germany and Italy; and not least, the circumstance, that it was at that time the grand depôt of all commercial intercourse between the two last countries, made it favourable for the access and accommodation of a numerous and opulent assembly. As the council lasted for nearly four years, the number of its members and their attendants must have greatly fluctuated; but if it be true, that at certain times not less than thirty thousand horses* were maintained for its use, we may conceive the splendour as well as the multitude of the assemblage. It was divided into four sections, following the grand national division of Europe; and all the members were arranged under the banners of Italy, of France, of Germany, or of England. Most of the leading ecclesiastics† of Europe were present; but the greater proportion of eminent laymen, who thronged to Constance, distinguished that council, more than any other circumstance, from all that had preceded it.

Its professed objects were the extinction of the schism and the Reformation of the Church. The persecutions of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, which formed a part of its labours, will be described and traced to their true motives in a following chapter. Even the subject of the Reformation must for the moment be deferred; since we must confine our present attention to the thread which we have pursued through so many windings, and trace the history of the Schism to its conclusion. And to some, indeed it might appear, and not without specious reason, that the schism was virtually extinct already; and that the feeble antipopes of Perpignan and of Rimini might have been safely left to waste their complaints and anathemas unnoticed. And so it might possibly have proved. But, on the other hand, the politics of Europe were at that time so fluctuating and faithless, that the slightest circumstance of national interest, or even of personal caprice or jealousy, might at any moment have transferred the obedience of a kingdom, and restored to Gregory or to Benedict the adhesion of a powerful party. So that there seemed no positive security for the concord of the Church, until the two schismatics should be deprived of the faintest shadow of authority.

evil stars, that he had so lightly deviated from his former mind and counsel." Leonard. Arétin, In Rerum Italic. Historia.

* Apprehensions being entertained about the means of providing for so many quadrupeds, it was ordered, that the Pope should be limited to twenty horses, the cardinals and princes to ten each, the bishops to five, and the abbots to four only. Raynald. ann. 1414, s. xiii.

† Nine and twenty cardinals and three hundred bishops and archbishops were present at the second session, on March 2, when the Pope made his abdication.

Hence it was, that all parties were chiefly anxious to attend to this subject, and to complete the work which had been so far advanced at Pisa*.

But here, at the very outset, a difference arose of the most essential importance, as to the manner of attaining that end. It will be observed, that the present assembly approached that question under circumstances dissimilar from those which guided the former. At Pisa, the impossibility of deciding between the two claimants having been admitted, neither of them was recognised by the council. The fathers were indeed personally divided in their obedience; but as a single legislative body they acknowledged neither Peter of Luna nor Angelo Corrario. Thus their course was obvious—to declare the See vacant, and to proceed to a canonical election. But the council of Constance, being held in continuation of that of Pisa, being bound by its decisions and resting on its validity, admitted of necessity the rights of John XXIII. And thus, whatsoever course its deliberations might take, it had to deal with a Pope of undisputed legitimacy. For though some feeble murmurs would be raised at Rimini and Perpignan, Constance at least was not the place where they could find an echo.

Under these circumstances the council met together, and soon afterwards John caused his own proposition to be laid before it. It was simply this—that the fathers should first of all things confirm all the acts of the council of Pisa; that they should next deliberate on the best means of carrying them into effect; and lastly enter upon their labours for the Reformation of the Church. In this paper the pope merely called upon the fathers publicly to declare, what they never for a moment disputed, the legality of that council, from which he derived his authority; and if that declaration were once made, he felt assured, that there could be no other method of proceeding against two denounced anti-popes, than by arming the real pope with additional authority to crush them. It was very natural, that John should take this view of the subject; indeed, as far as the strict justice of the question was concerned, it was the correct view; and assuredly the distinction between a pope and a schismatic was sufficiently broad, to be made ground for decided action with an assembly of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics.

Nevertheless there were many, and some of the most celebrated doctors of the age were among them, who considered the subject in a widely different light. These loudly maintained, that as the council of Constance was a continuation of that of Pisa, it was bound steadily to pursue the same object; that this object had been the extinction of the schism, and that it was still so; and that a solemn obligation rested on all the prelates present, even on the pope himself, to adopt whatsoever means should appear most efficacious for that purpose. It was immediately obvious to what end this opinion tended—that the method of cession, which had been attempted with such imperfect success at Pisa, would be again brought forward as the only healing measure; and that the true and recognized Pope would be called upon for the same humiliation, and

* The bare circumstance, that there were three competitors for the chair after the council of Pisa, and only two before it, has led many historians to consider that assembly as having increased the schism. But to us it seems otherwise. It reduced the anti-popes to an insignificance, from which they never recovered, and it united the great body of Christendom in the same views, and with a common principle. If it was not immediately successful, neither was the council of Constance perfectly so. But the proceedings of Pisa were the foundation of the re-union, and it was by building on them, that the work was finally completed.

probably subjected to the same compulsion, with two anathematized pretenders.

The subject was warmly debated; but without any approach to a decision, because the emperor was not yet arrived; and as much certainly depended on his views, so the attention and even the hopes of both parties were earnestly fixed upon him. Sigismond possessed considerable talents and accomplishments; he spoke several languages with fluency and even eloquence, and was the patron of learning, in an age when it still needed powerful protection. The dignity of his personal appearance has attracted the commendations of history*; and if his moral character was not free from stain, and if his military enterprises generally ended in disgrace, he has been abundantly honoured for his zeal in the service of the Church, and his exertions against heresy and schism.

His previous intercourse with John, and the obligations which he certainly owed to him, led many to believe, that he would throw his weight into the pontifical scale—nor was reason wanting to incline him to that side. But it proved otherwise. He probably reflected, that, should he determine unequivocally to support and enforce the rights of John, no other method remained to reduce the antipopes, except violence—the princes of Arragon and Rimini would not otherwise renounce their obedience. The disposition of Sigismond was known; but matters had not yet proceeded to any determination, when legates presented themselves both from Gregory and Benedict. The latter, indeed, merely insulted the council by the usual vague and faithless offers of conference and compromise. But the former declared their authority to make a formal cession on behalf of their master, in case that *both* his rivals should abdicate also. From that moment the exertions of the great majority of the fathers were directed to one object—to accomplish by some means or other the abdication of John.

Now, as they never affected on any occasion to throw the slightest doubts on his legitimacy, it became them to take their measures with deference and caution; and when they pressed upon him the general obligations of his office, and argued, that he was bound, as chief of the Church of Christ, willingly to lay down, not his dignity only, but life itself, if the interests of that Church required it, we shall not wonder, that the Pope was unmoved by so indeterminate an appeal. But the council felt its strength; and the above appeal was accompanied by the new and bold proposition, that a General Council possessed the power, in a peculiar exigency, to *compel* the Pope to abdication. This assertion gave rise to long and warm discussions; the Italian prelates maintained the papal cause, but with less vigour and ability, than the circumstances required, and even than the merits of the question admitted. The superiority of learning and genius was on the side of the French; and the powerful harangues of Pierre d'Ailly and the celebrated Gerson, Chancellor of the University, added weight to a doubtful cause. It seemed clear that the party of John must yield.

In the meantime, the Archbishop of Mayence, the Primate of the German Church and Elector of the empire, arrived with great pomp at Constance, and immediately declared his adherence to the cause of the Pope. Frederick of Austria and the Duke of Burgundy were likewise enlisted on the

* Leonardus Aretinus (Rer. Italicar. Historia) speaks of him thus:—"Fuit proculdubio vir inclytus, præclara facie, corpore tum specioso, tum robusto; magnitudine animi sive pace sive bello eximia; liberalitate vero tanta, ut hoc unum illi vitio daretur, quod largiendo et erogando sibi ipsi facultates detraheret ad negotia bellaque obeunda."

same side. But Sigismond had now decidedly espoused the opposite principles; and thus the French and Italian, which first divided the Council, now really became the imperial and papal parties. This was the crisis of the contest; and the great majority of three of the nations was manifestly on the side of the Emperor. Still, before they proceeded to the question, it was feared that, as the Italian prelates were the most numerous and under the most direct influence, and would, probably, be unanimous for the Pope, they might be able to *The Council declares for the cession,* outvote the majorities of the other nations. It was, therefore, advanced as a fair proposal, and finally arranged, that each nation should separately ascertain its own sense, and that then, on the general meeting, the majority of nations, not the numerical majority of votes, should prevail. On the day appointed, they met together, and it then appeared that the decision in favour of the method of cession was unanimous—to the astonishment of the whole council, the greater portion even of the Italians themselves had adopted that opinion.

During the progress of these deliberations, there were some who judged, from the customary tenacity of other Popes, that still further measures might afterwards be called for. And *and the Pope in that apprehension, a long list of personal charges abdicates,* against John XXIII., some of which involved the most abominable offences, was handed about among the fathers; and a copy came under the inspection of the Pope himself. John then saw the real nature of the tempest that was hanging over him, and immediately determined to avert it by timely submission. He expressed that intention amidst the acclamations of the whole assembly; and after some unimportant disputes respecting the formula of cession, he publicly pronounced (on the 2d of March) his solemn and voluntary abdication*.

The cession of John was, of course, conditional on that of the antipopes; and as no difficulties were any longer offered by Gregory, the accomplishment of the union rested wholly with Peter of Luna. To this end a conference was proposed at Nice, between Sigismond and the King of Arragon; and as it seemed that Benedict was to be one of the parties, John claimed his right to be also present on the occasion. This demand excited some suspicions of his sincerity; and these were confirmed by a proposal, which he soon afterwards made, to transfer the Council from Constance to Nice. It was difficult, after the instances of pontifical duplicity which had disgraced the last forty years, to put trust in the honesty of any Pope; and the character of John was not such as to command any peculiar confidence. Consequently, the Council required of him a formal deed or procuration of cession; and he, without hesitation, refused it. Guards were then placed about the gates of the city; but, on the urgent remonstrance of the Pope, removed. Howbeit, whether he had previously meditated an escape from

* The formula finally agreed on was to the following effect: "We, John XXIII., for the repose of the people of Christ, profess, promise, vow, and swear, before God, the Church, and this sacred Council, freely and with our entire good will, to give peace to the Church by the method of a simple and pure cession to be made by us of the Sovereign Pontificate, and to accomplish it effectually through the wisdom of the present Council,—whenever Peter of Luna and Angelo Corrario shall similarly renounce, in person or by their delegates, the Popedom to which they pretend. And we also promise to do the same thing, howsoever that may occur, whether by cession or by death, or by any other way, so that it shall become possible to unite the Church of God through our cession, and thus to extirpate the present schism."

the power of the Council, as soon as it proved too great for him, or whether he was driven to that resolution (as may also have been) by the distrust and even harshness with which he was treated; it is certain that, on the morning of March 21, the Emperor and the Fathers learnt with dismay and astonishment, that the Pope was no longer at Constance. He had quitted the city, in the night, in a military disguise; and, having instantly embarked, had descended the Rhine as far as Schaffhausen, a city of his protector, Frederic.

The consternation of the Council was somewhat abated by a communication received from John on the following day, in which he renewed his assurances of sincerity, and justified his retreat from Constance by the argument, that his personal security was necessary to give obligation to the promise of cession; and hereupon he was joined by several Cardinals and other prelates. But the great majority remained behind, in close co-operation with the Emperor; and both they and he immediately engaged in the most vigorous measures. For, on the one hand, Sigismond put in motion the temporal forces of the Assembly, and directed a powerful army against the States of Frederic; and on the other, the Fathers of the Council and the doctors of Paris, with Gerson at their head, advanced in mighty spiritual array against the pontifical deserter. And while the imperial soldiers approached the walls of Schaffhausen, the bulwarks of Popery were assailed from the pulpits of Constance.

The momentous question was now publicly argued, whether a Council General of the Church did not possess an authority superior to the Pope. The rights of the Council were advocated by the eloquence of Gerson*, and asserted by the general consent of the Fathers of Constance. The opposite opinion was maintained by the seceders at Schaffhausen; and these even ventured to assert, that the Council itself was virtually dissolved by the absence of the Pope. It has generally been the error of high churchmen to advance the loftiest pretensions at the most unseasonable moments; and instead of receding at a crisis of violence and danger, to rush with a sort of effeminate rashness into perils, which would not otherwise have reached them. A decided breach now took place between the two parties; but after some vain replications and negotiations, it became perfectly clear on which side the real strength lay. The Court of Schaffhausen daily diminished, and the Council proceeded by vigorous acts to give efficacy to the principle of its own superiority. Nevertheless, the Pope would not acknowledge his defeat, but rather determined to risk the experiment by a second flight; intending, as it would seem, to throw himself on the protection of the Duke of Burgundy, and establish his residence at Avignon. He halted at Brisac, and a deputation from the Council found him there; he fixed the following morning to give them audience, but on the following morning John XXIII. was no longer at Brisac. We shall not trace the fruitless negotiations which followed: it is sufficient to add, that during their progress the Duke of Austria prevailed upon the Pope to take refuge at Fribourg, under his own sacred protection—for the Duke, being severely pressed in his contest with the Emperor, and foreseeing his entire discomfiture, was desirous to possess the means of reconciliation. Having succeeded in this desire, he hastened to violate his vows, and to sacrifice his virtue and reputation, by surrendering the person of his guest. And thus, says Maimbourg, the unfortunate Pope, who, disorderly and licentious as

* De Auferibilitate Papæ ab Ecclesia.

he was, failed not to be an object of great compassion through the treachery practised against him by his protector, was betrayed; and found himself a prisoner in the Castle of Fribourg, the very place where he had thought to find an asylum. *He is betrayed,*

The Council then turned to the affair of his deposition, observing in this matter the same forms which had been followed at Pisa in the process against Gregory and Benedict. The list of accusations presented against John XXIII. consisted of fifty articles; but the whole weight of his offences might be comprised under five or six heads. He was charged with all the various modifications of simony; with squandering and alienating the property of the Church; and with oppressing the people by unjust acts and exorbitant imposts. His escape from Constance, and his subsequent endeavours to elude the demands of the Council, were urged against him with the greater minuteness, as they were the most recent and the least pardonable of his offences. Another class of charges related to his official, another to his private delinquencies. It was asserted that, as Pope, he had disregarded the divine offices, neglected to repeat his breviary, and rarely assisted at the celebration of mass; and that, even when he did so, he recited the service rapidly and carelessly, like a sportsman or a soldier*. It was added, that he had wholly disregarded the fasts and abstinences of the Church. As to the scandals of his private life, they were traced with minute diligence, even from his childhood to his flight from Constance. In his earliest youth the intemperance of his disposition betrayed itself: his most innocent years were charged with falsehood, impudence, disobedience to his parents, a tendency to every vice. His progress in life was a progress in iniquity. Murder by violence and by poison, adultery, incest, the most abominable impurities were imputed to him, as unquestioned and notorious. Such is the substance of the allegations recorded by Roman Catholic writers against their spiritual Father; but it must not be forgotten, that, in the list formally presented to the Council and to the Pope, these last charges were suppressed. This might be with a view to spare the Catholic Church so monstrous a scandal; or through consideration to the conscience and character of the Cardinals, who had so lately elected such a Pope; but it might also be, because they rested on slight foundations, and proceeded from that popular licence, which so eagerly calumniates the fallen fortunes of the great.

It is not disputed, that the paper, which received the approbation of the Council, contained many heinous charges, expressed in very unequivocal language, and confirmed by numerous *accused*, testimonies. But the Pope, when it was presented to him for inspection and refutation, calmly replied, with the most submissive respect for the Council, that he had little curiosity to read either the charges or the depositions; but that of this the Fathers might rest assured, that he should receive their decision, whatever it might be, with perfect deference; in the meantime, that his best defence was in their justice. This was politic, for from the moment in which the Council determined upon the method of cession, John very clearly perceived that the Pontificate had passed from his hands. For a time, indeed, he probably hoped, through the support of the Dukes of Austria and Burgundy, to retain a partial obedience and wear a divided mitre; but no sooner did he

* Et si aliquoties celebravit, hoc fuit currenter, more venatorum et armigerorum. Act. Concil. Const.,

become the prisoner of the Council, than even that hope abandoned him; and his only remaining object was to secure, in a private station, his personal freedom and security. Accordingly, he addressed a respectful and even pathetic letter to Sigismond, in which he reminded him of services formerly conferred, and supplicated in return his friendship, or at least his clemency. This appeal was written in a tone of deep humiliation, and with an affectation of attachment, which could scarcely be sincere. But neither Emperor nor Council was softened by this tardy display of obsequiousness. At a full Session, held on the 29th of May, *and deposed.* John XXIII. was solemnly deposed from the Pontificate.

By the same sentence he was condemned to imprisonment during the pleasure of the Council, which reserved to itself the power of imposing such other penalties as should, in due season, be declared.

This sentence was communicated to John in his confinement at Cell; he perused it without any emotion, and requested a short interval of solitude. After two hours, he ordered the deputies again into his presence; and then, after reading all the articles in succession, with a firm voice and unruffled manner, he declared to them that there was no particular, which did not receive his complete approbation; and that, as far as in him lay, he cordially confirmed and ratified the sentence. To this assurance he added a voluntary vow, that he would never at any time protest against that sentence, nor make any attempt to recover the Pontificate—that, on the contrary, he renounced purely and simply, and from the bottom of his heart, any right which he ever had, or might still have, to that dignity; that, in proof of this, he had already removed from his chamber the pontifical cross, and would throw off the pontifical garments as willingly, if he had any others to put on in their place; that he wished with all his soul, that he had never been Pope at all, since he had not enjoyed one single happy day since his exaltation; and so far was he from wishing to be restored to that dignity, that should any desire his re-election, he would never at any time consent to it. He then threw himself, with his former humility, on the mercy of the Council and the Emperor—not, however, without reminding them, that he possessed legitimate means of defence, of which he had not yet availed himself, but to which he should certainly appeal, should they drive him, by more rigorous measures, to further extremities.

This conduct, which was not only politic, but generous, succeeded not in obtaining for him any mitigation of his sentence. He was led away in close confinement, first to Heidelberg, and afterwards to Manheim, where he was imprisoned for three years. Neither did it avail him anything to have once possessed the friendship of Sigismond. Nay, so far was the severity of the sentence enforced, that he was deprived of the services of his Italian attendants, and surrounded by Germans, with whom his ignorance of the language permitted no other intercourse, than by signs*. Such rigour, exercised against a fallen Pope, awakened sympathy and swelled the ranks of his advocates; and there were many who maintained, both then and afterwards, that his deposition was illegal and compulsory, since the charge of heresy, on which alone a Pope could be canonically deposed,

* Platina and Naucerus assert the severity with which John was treated. Theodoric of Niem gives a different account, on the authority, as he says, of well-informed persons. There are differences, too, on some other particulars, which we have not thought it necessary to specify. The historians who have been principally consulted for the contents of this chapter (besides the original authorities) are Maimbourg, the Continuator of Fleury, Lenfant (Hist. du Conc. de Constance), Pagi (Breviar. Gest. Pontif. Roman.), and Spondanus.

was not that, which occasioned the degradation of John XXIII. The Court of France openly professed this opinion; and the offence, which Charles VI. on that occasion took at the exceeding zeal of the University, repressed the ardour and diminished the credit of that illustrious body.

In the meantime, the Council advanced onwards in the course which it had chosen. It had now assumed the despotic* control of the Church; and in its first exercise of that power, it published a declaration that the Cardinals could not proceed to a new election without its consent. By its next decision the formalities attending the cession of Gregory were duly completed, and the old man was permitted to *resign* that which no one acknowledged that he possessed. The attention of the Council and the whole Catholic world was then turned entirely towards the determination of Peter of Luna.

His determination was simply this,—to cling to the ruins of his fortunes—to clasp the name and shadow of the Pontificate—to persevere in his pretensions and his *Conduct of Benedict.* perjury to the end of his life. Nevertheless, it saw necessary to treat him with temper and deference, as long as he was supported even by a single Prince. The method of conference was that which he still proposed, and the Council now assented to it; and as the King of Arragon was prevented by sickness from travelling to Nice, Sigismond professed his willingness to undertake in person the journey to Perpignan. It was in vain, that Benedict exhausted the resources of his ingenuity to retard, at least, if he could not impede, the advance of the Emperor: his artifices were foiled by the firmness of a candid mind resolutely bent on a noble object; and on the 18th of September Sigismond arrived, with a small number of attendants, at the place of conference.

An extraordinary scene was then enacted. Ferdinand of Arragon sincerely desired the extinction of the schism; ambassadors from the courts of Castille and Navarre, and others who were present, united their vows for the same object. The Emperor pressed it with all his talents and all his power—Benedict alone opposed himself to the unanimity of Christendom. Whatever was most convincing in argument or persuasive in rhetoric was repeatedly urged upon him by the Princes and their deputies. If any pretext for his resistance had hitherto been furnished by the pertinacity of his competitors, this, they maintained, was now removed by the cession and deposition of Gregory and John. The condition, on which he had sworn to abdicate, was at length accomplished beyond dispute; and his honour, his conscience, his promises, his oaths unequivocally obliged him to fulfil his part. Henceforward the concord of Christendom depended wholly upon him. After eight-and-thirty years of schism, disorder, and desolation, Benedict was the only remaining obstacle to the union, repose, and welfare of the Christian world. The Church herself, if she was indeed entrusted by the Almighty to his care and guidance, now stretched forth her arms to him, from the abyss of misery in which she was sunk, and sadly supplicated, that he would raise her from her degradation; that he would voluntarily sacrifice that dignity, which he could not possibly retain

* Hence it proceeded, *papaliter*, to interfere with the State also. Previously to Sigismond's departure for Perpignan, through France, it published an edict—"Quicumque, cujuscunque status aut conditionis existat, *etiamsi regalis* . . . euntes aut redeuntes impederit, perturbaverit—sententia excommunicationis percellitur—et ulterius omni honore et dignitate ipso facto est privatus." Act. Concil. Constan., Sess. xvii. This sudden assumption of the power of deposition astonished all sovereigns, but especially insulted the King of France.

much longer; and that he would invest his few remaining years with the gratitude and blessings of mankind, rather than adhere, amid universal detestation, to a mere name, which an early death, followed by eternal infamy, was now at hand to tear away from him.

These arguments, urged by the highest secular powers, were confirmed by other authority, which may have given them additional value in the eyes of a churchman and a Pope. There were two holy brothers named Vincent and Boniface Ferrier*, who had hitherto faithfully adhered to the cause of Benedict, and whose acknowledged piety and supposed inspiration seemed to lend it some sort of sanctity. These venerable persons now joined their friendly eloquence to turn the heart of Benedict; and they fortified their appeal by declaring, that, as the reproach of schism must henceforward rest on his party, they should be compelled, in case of his further opposition, to desert him†.

Benedict was not moved by any of these considerations. Whether it was, that in the conscientious belief that he was the true Pope, he considered it a religious, or (what might be equally sacred in his mind) an ecclesiastical duty, to preserve his office to the end of his life; or whether (as is more probable), the love of power grew with the progress of his years, and the decay of his vigour, so as finally to close his heart against any representations of reason or decency,—he maintained his constant resolution inflexibly. As he had always been the legitimate, so was he now, forsooth, the only, Pontiff: the deposition of both his adversaries confirmed him, without competition, in the possession of the See. So that, if the schism were still permitted to subsist (he continued), the scandal must rest with the Council of Constance, not with him. For his own part, he was determined never to abandon the bark of St. Peter, of which the helm had been confided to him by God; and the older he became, and the nearer he approached to death and the judgment, the stronger was his obligation to resist the tempest, and avert the anger of Heaven by persevering in the course assigned to him. In conclusion, he enforced the necessity of at once uniting all the faithful in universal obedience to himself. Benedict was now in his seventy-eighth year; nevertheless, he argued his own cause before a public assembly for seven entire hours, with such courage, fervour, and impetuosity, as to leave it uncertain whether his extraordinary energy was derived from ambition, or from fanaticism, or from a strange combination of both.

The result of this singular contest was not yet perfectly manifest. On the one side was the secular and spiritual power of Europe, the authority of kings, the prayers of the people, the consent of the Catholic Church—reason, and justice, and every wise, and every good principle, arrayed against the infatuated obstinacy of one crafty, faithless, old man. Yet the thoughtful were still in some suspense, and many had greater fears from the inveterate subtlety of Benedict, than hopes from the union of so many Princes.... But it proved otherwise; the parties engaged in the Conference had no personal interest in favour of that pretender; and his

* This same Vincent Ferrier is addressed by Gerson from Constance, as a patron of the sect of the Flagellants, whom the chancellor earnestly exhorts him to abandon. Nevertheless he is designated as "Theologus et Orator toto orbe inclutus." The documents are given by Von der Hardt, tom. iii., pars vii.

† Theodoric of Niem mentions that Vincent Ferrier did then, in fact, take so decided a part against his former master, as to declare it a merit to persecute or kill him. "Quod sit vir pravus et fallax et fictus, decipiendo populum Dei, quodque justè persequendus sit usque ad mortem ab omnibus Christianis, &c." . . . Vit. Johann. XXIII. p. 63. This holy zealot had as little charity in his enmity, as discretion in his friendship.

perversity was so remote from reason, that it served rather to cement the confederacy against him. It was resolved, however, to make one final attempt at persuasion. But here Benedict, perceiving the firmness of his adversaries, and fearing their ultimate design, withdrew his person from their power, and quitted Perpignan. He retired, after some hesitation, to a place called Paniscola,—a fortress situated near Tortosa and the mouth of the Ebro, an ancient possession of the House of Luna. Four cardinals, and a small body of soldiers, followed him.

Any hopes which he may have derived from this proceeding, beyond that of mere personal security, were disappointed. The Assembly at Perpignan, being now relieved from the constraint which his presence still occasioned to those, who still acknowledged him, immediately, and by a formal act, renounced its obedience. Not long afterwards, Scotland, which had taken no part in these measures, but continued to adhere without scruple to its first decision, being now persuaded that Benedict was the only remaining obstacle to the general concord, followed the example of the Conference. And then, at length,* the Council of Constance felt itself empowered to inflict the final blow. The sentence of deposition was pronounced against Peter of Luna, according to the prescribed forms; and the bolt, which had fallen *His deposition.* almost harmless from the Assembly of Pisa, descended on this occasion with greater efficacy, because its object was already virtually deposed, through the secession of his royal adherents. . . . In the mean time, the aged Ecclesiastic, against whom the storm which himself had raised was now in justice directed, was not moved to any act of concession, or any show of humiliation. Twice deposed by two General Councils—twice anathematized by the great and almost unanimous consent of the Catholic Church—deserted by the secular powers, who had so long countenanced his perfidy and protected his adversity—abandoned by the most venerable, even among his spiritual followers—and confined to a narrow and solitary residence—the Pope of Paniscola still preserved the mockery of a court, and presided in his empty council-hall. And thence, in the magnanimity of disappointment and despair, he launched his daily anathema against Ferdinand of Arragon, and retorted, with ludicrous earnestness, the excommunications of the Christian world.

The Council of Constance, having thus at length, through the perseverance of its Imperial Director, removed the three competitors whose disputes had rent the Church, proceeded to provide for its future integrity; and, that no pretext might possibly be left for subsequent dissension, it was determined, for this occasion only, to make an addition to the Elective Assembly. The entire College of the united Cardinals consisted, at that time, of thirty members; and to this body a second, consisting of six ecclesiastics from each of the *five*† nations, was associated. It was further regulated, that the consent of two-thirds both of the sacred college and of the deputies of each nation should be required for the validity of the election,—so many were the interests which it was necessary to reconcile, so severe were the precautions required, to secure for the future Pontiff the

*Election of Martin V. by
the Council, and termination of the schism.*

* On July 26th, 1417.

† As soon as the fate of Benedict was decided, the Spanish nation was added to the four, which had hitherto constituted the Assembly.

undivided obedience of Europe. Accordingly, on the 8th of November, 1417, the electors entered into conclave, and after a deliberation of three days, they agreed in the choice of Otho Colonna (Martin V.), a noble and virtuous Roman.

The character of Martin pointed him out as the man destined to repair the ruins of the Church. The announcement was received with enthusiastic expressions of delight; the Emperor was the first to prostrate himself at the holy Prelate's feet, in a transport of rapture, which was shared, or affected, by the vast assembly present. And it was not without reasonable ground of confidence—it was not without many motives for self-satisfaction, and many just claims on the gratitude of that age and that Church, that Sigismond and the Council at length approached the termination of their labours. To us, indeed, looking back from our brighter elevation upon the means of the disputants and the subject of the strife, it will, perhaps, appear, that so powerful a combination of temporal and spiritual authority might have accomplished in a much shorter space the destruction of a profligate Pope and two denounced pretenders—that the force employed was disproportionate to the end—that the methods were indirect and dilatory, marked by too much ceremony and too little vigour. But we should thus determine inconsiderately, and without due regard to the maxims and prejudices of those days. When we reflect, that a century had scarcely yet elapsed since Boniface VIII. was exulting in the plenitude of spiritual despotism; that, even to the end of the Avignon succession, the lofty attributes of Papacy remained, as heretofore, unviolated and almost unquestioned; when we recollect, too, how slow and difficult are the triumphs of reason over prescriptive absurdities, we shall rather admire the firmness exhibited at Constance, and the courage with which some Papal principles were overthrown, than censure that assembly for not having more hastily accomplished, what it did at length accomplish effectually.

The Council continued its sessions* for a few months after the election of Martin, and was then dismissed, or rather *Fate of the Pretenders.* adjourned, for the space of five years. Pavia was the place appointed for the next meeting; and the Pope proceeded towards Rome, to occupy and refit his shattered vessel. Nevertheless, with whatever security he may have approached his See, he must sometimes have reflected, that there still lived three men, who had enjoyed in their turns the dignity which he now held, and who had clung to it with extreme pertinacity. It was fair to presume that their ambition would not depart from them, except with life; and that any casual circumstance, which might offer to any one of them the means of recovering any portion of his power, would find him eager to embrace it. So long as they breathed, the concord of the Church could scarcely be deemed secure; let us then follow their history to its termination. Gregory did not long survive the act of his cession; he lived long enough to emerge from the condition of dishonour and guilt, into which his weakness had thrown him, and little longer; and if his last act had been less obviously the effect of compulsion, we might have admitted it as some atonement for his previous delinquency.

Peter of Luna continued for about six years to proclaim his legitimacy, and exult in his martyrdom. Every day the walls of Paniscola were

* These were forty-five in number; lasting, at various intervals, from November 16th, 1414, to August 9th, 1418.

astonished by the repetition of his anathemas; but the bolts were innocuous: but for the temporary departure of Alfonso of Arragon from the principles of his predecessor, they would scarcely have been heard beyond the fortress gates; nor did they disturb, in any degree, the repose of Christendom. He died suddenly, in the year 1424*, in extreme old age; but his vigour, which was still fresh and unabated, gave some colour to the suspicion of poison, which attends his death. It is at least certain, that, as soon as he perceived his final hour approaching, he commanded the attendance of his *two* Cardinals, the faithful remnant of his court, and addressed them with his wonted intrepidity. And then, even at this last crisis, when ambition and interest could not possibly sway him longer, he asserted with his parting breath, that he was the true and only Pope, and that it was absolutely essential for the purity of the Church to continue the succession. On this he adjured his two hearers, on pain of his pontifical malediction, to elect a successor. Having secured their obedience, he died; and it is related in ecclesiastical records, that six years afterwards his body was found entire, and without symptom of decay; and that, being then transported to Igluera, a town of Arragon, the property of his family, it long continued, and perchance may still continue, to resist the visitation of corruption.

His character has not escaped equally inviolate; and the censures by which it is perpetually assailed, cannot in justice be suppressed or softened. His talents were unquestionably vivid and active; but they were of a mean description,—the mere machines of intrigue and subtilty,—the energies of a contemptible and contracted soul. He was eminent in sanctity, and the integrity of private life. But what manner of integrity or sanctity is that, which is found consistent with ambition, and selfishness, and perjury; which can wrap itself in duplicity at any call of interest, and pursue a seeming expediency through fraud, and faithlessness, and falsehood? But at least (it is said) Benedict was sincere in believing, that he was the true Pope, and that through his perseverance alone the succession could be preserved uninterrupted. . . . Was he so sincere? When he advocated so warmly the necessity of mutual concession, during the reign of his predecessor, then, at least, he was not persuaded, that the purity of the Catholic Church was identical with obedience to the pretenders of Avignon. Had he been so persuaded, he could not himself have accepted the pontificate as a conditional boon; nor bound himself by oath to cede, on specific terms, that trust, which afterwards he proclaimed it his religious duty to maintain, under every circumstance. Assuredly, if his sincerity in this respect must be admitted, we must, at the same time, acknowledge, that he was not impressed with it till *after* his elevation; and that it was then so closely connected with his ambition, as to make it impossible for the historian, as it might be difficult even for himself, to distinguish between them.

The two Cardinals obeyed the parting injunction of their master, and chose for his successor one Gilles Mugnos, who called himself Clement VIII. But, not long afterwards, Alfonso finally withdrew his protection from his creature; Mugnos retired, without a struggle, to his former obscurity; and the succession of pretenders, which had been imposed upon the Church by the Couclave at Anagni, was at length at an end.

* The year is disputed. We follow Spondanus, ann. 1424, s. iii. The circumstance that he held, at least, the name of Pope for thirty years—a space longer than any predecessor—has been seriously urged as an argument *against* his legitimacy. ‘Non videtur dies Petri,’ the prophetic address to the successors of the apostle, had not been accomplished in the case of Luna, therefore he could not be a genuine successor.

One other object of our curiosity still remains, Baltazar Cossa, the President, the adversary, and the victim of the Council of Constance. Very soon after the dissolution of that assembly, the Republic of Florence, which had been unceasingly attached to the cause, or at least to the person and sufferings, of the captive, earnestly solicited his liberation from Martin V. ; and it appears that, presently afterwards, whether through the imprudence*, the policy, or the generosity of that Pope, Baltazar was restored to liberty. He returned to Italy, and presented himself as a simple ecclesiastic among his former associates and dependents. His popular qualities had secured him many adherents, and their affection was not shaken by his adversity. In some places he was welcomed with cordial salutations, but Parma was the principal scene of his triumph and temptation ; for there he found a powerful party prepared to revive and support his abrogated claims to the chair. These warmly pressed him to resume his dignity, and their solicitations were seconded by several individuals who had tasted his former bounty, or had hopes from his future gratitude ; all joined in protesting against the violence which he had suffered at Constance, and conjured him once more to array himself in the pontifical vestments, which were rightfully his own. This was not all : even in the calculations of success there seemed some ground for hope. The independent states of Italy would probably declare in his favour, and the numerous petty tyrants, who had usurped the patrimony of the Church, would assuredly unite against the acknowledged Pope. These circumstances were represented to Baltazar, and he fully comprehended their importance. Some wrongs, too, some unnecessary hardships, he had unquestionably endured at the hands of the emperor and council. Baltazar patiently listened to the seductions of his friends ; and then, without returning them any answer, he suddenly took his resolution. He departed from the city hastily, and without any attendants ; and proceeded to Florence, where the Pope then resided, in the garb of a fugitive and a suppliant. Immediately, without requiring any formal security for his person, he sought for Martin, and in the presence of a full assembly cast himself humbly at his feet ; and while he recognized him with due reverence as the legitimate Vicar of Christ, he repeated his solemn ratification of the acts of the Council, and of his own deposition.

Most of those, who witnessed this spectacle, were affected to tears ; for

* The account of Leonardus Aretinus (in *Rerum Italic. Historia*), who had the means of knowing the truth, is not so favourable to the motives of either party, as that which we would more willingly adopt. "John, after his captivity and abdication, was imprisoned in Bavaria. But many had a scruple, whether his deposition and abdication, being forcible, was legitimate. And if that was doubtful, the legitimacy of Martin also came into dispute. With this apprehension, and, at the same time, lest the Princes of Germany, possessing this image (idolum) of a Pope, should some day take some advantage of it, Martin engaged in measures for his redemption and restoration to Italy. Therefore, when on his liberation he arrived in France, and then learnt the counsel of Martin (which was to confine him for life at Mantua), before he arrived at Mantua, he turned off towards Genoa ; and there being free, and his own master, whether induced by conscience, or by despair of success in any hostile enterprise, he voluntarily came to Florence, and throwing himself at the feet of Martin, recognized him as the true and only Pontiff. In adventu ejus tota civitas obviam profusa multis lacrimis et incredibili commiseratione respexit hominem de tantæ dignitatis fastigio in tantas calamitates prolapsam. Ipse quoque miserabili prope habitu incedebat, &c." . . . The Florentines, on the other hand, were not very fond of Pope Martin ; and he is related, by the same historian, to have been almost childishly affected by a song then popular among the rabble, of which the burden was—

Papa Martino non val un quattrino.

they beheld the man, in whose presence all had once been prostrate, now voluntarily humbling himself before the throne, which he had so lately occupied, and before an individual, who had honoured him, for nearly five years, as his lord and pontiff. Martin V. shared the general emotion and the reciprocal conduct of these two prelates furnishes an instance of magnanimous generosity, which too rarely illustrates the annals of the Church. The Pope resolved to exalt his predecessor as near to his former dignity, as was consistent with his own supremacy. Baltazar Cossa was appointed cardinal and dean of the Sacred College; in all public ceremonies, whether of chapels, consistories, or other assemblies, Baltazar was placed by the side of the Pontiff, on a loftier seat than any other ecclesiastic; he was honoured by the confidence of his master, and he repaid it by undeviating fidelity.

That fidelity may, indeed, have cost him no struggle; and if we should believe his former declaration, that from the moment of his elevation to the chair he had never enjoyed one day of happiness, the most enviable portion of his life may really have been that, in which he was followed by general commiseration. But whether he passed his remaining days in successful conflict with a bad and powerful passion, or whether (as seems to us more probable) he surveyed with philosophical disdain the dignity of which he had felt the cares, and had not valued the vanities,—in either case, he exhibited a vigour and expanse of mind, which is rarely found in man. . . . It is true, that the usual portraits of John XXIII. would not prepare us to expect such virtue in him. But that Pope has been, in truth, too hardly treated by historians. His enemies, in all ages, have been the powerful party; and the monstrous imputations, which originated at Constance, have been too eagerly repeated both by Protestant and other writers. Baltazar Cossa was a mere soldier*,—deeply stained, no doubt, with the loose immorality which then commonly attached to that profession, but not destitute of candid and manly resolution, nor of those worldly principles, which make men honourable. It is entirely unquestionable, that he was never actuated, even in appearance, by any sense of religion; that he was wholly disqualified even for the lowest ministry in God's Church; but he lived in an age in which the ecclesiastical and military characters were still deemed consistent, and in a Church, which had long permitted the most dissolute demeanour to its directors. As grand master of a military order, Baltazar Cossa might have descended to posterity with untarnished celebrity; and even the apostolical chair, had he possessed it some fifty years later, would have pardoned, under the protection of his warlike enterprise, the pollution and scandal of his vices.

* He is said to have exercised in his youth the trade of a pirate. . . . "*Dum simplex Clericus ac in adolescentia constitutus existeret, cum quibusdam fratribus suis piraticam in mari Neapolitano, ut fertur, exercuit, &c.*" . . . To the habits thus acquired, is attributed a peculiarity which followed him even to the Papedom, of devoting the night to business, and the day to sleep. Theod. of Niem, Vit. Johann. XXIII. His character is fairly discussed by Sismondi (Rep. Ital. chap. lxii.), who truly remarks, that, had he been as abandoned as he is sometimes described, he would scarcely have been *twice* raised to the pontificate (for he was really chosen when Alexander V. was made Pope), nor retained so many valuable friends to the end of his life. Leonardus Aretinus describes him to have been "*Vir in temporalibus quidem magnus; in spiritualibus vero nullus omnino et ineptus.*" . . . *Rer. Italic. Historia.*

NOTE ON THE WHITE PENITENTS AND OTHER ENTHUSIASTS.

(I.) Giovanni Villani (lib. xi. cap. xxiii.) relates, that in 1334 one Venturius of Bergamo, a mendicant preacher, a man of no eminence or family distinction, created a strong, though temporary, sensation in Lombardy and Tuscany. The object of his preaching was to *bring sinners to repentance*; and so great was the success, and so visible were the fruits of his eloquence, that more than ten thousand Lombards, of whom many were of the higher ranks, set out to pass the season of Lent at Rome. They were clad in the habit of St. Dominic; they travelled in troops of twenty-five or thirty, preceded by a cross; and their incessant cry was 'Peace and mercy.' During fifteen successive days, the time of their passage through Florence, they were entertained by that enlightened people with respect and charity; and so great became the renown and influence of the preacher, that they came to the knowledge of the court of Avignon, and awakened the jealousy of Pope Benedict. Venturius was arrested, and summoned before the Inquisition on the charge of heresy; and though acquitted by that tribunal, he was still retained in confinement by papal authority. 'Such,' says Villani, 'are the rewards which holy persons receive from the prelates of the Church—unless, indeed, the above was inflicted as a just chastisement upon the overbearing ambition of that friar, though doubtless his intentions were excellent.'

(II.) We read in Spondanus, that in the year 1374 there arose in Belgium a sect of Dancers, who paraded the streets, entered houses and churches half naked, crowned with garlands, dancing and singing, uttering unknown names, falling senseless on the ground, and exhibiting other marks of demoniacal agitation. Many were found to imitate them; and thus much (says the historian) appears certain, that this effect was produced through the visitation of an evil spirit; for they were healed by the charms of the exorcists, and by the reading of St. John's gospel, or of the expressions by which Christ is recorded to have cast out devils, as also of the Apostle's Creed. The same writer proceeds more reasonably to attribute their disease to the want of religious instruction. But it was needless to seek particular causes for the appearance of one of those distempers, which have disfigured the best ages of the Church, at a time when the disorders of the ecclesiastical government were so generally felt and confessed; when the people were beginning to exercise in so many quarters a freedom of opinion, yet feebly moderated by reason or knowledge; and when religion was the subject, to which the greater portion of this irregular independence was directed.

(III.) We shall, therefore, content ourselves with mentioning one other eruption of enthusiasm, which was more violent, indeed, and more celebrated, than the last, but apparently even more transient. In the year 1399, when the Christian world was astounded by the triumphs of the Turks and the Tartars from without, and shocked by the schism and the vices which it exposed and occasioned within, a body of devotees descended the Alps into Italy, and began to preach Peace and Repentance. They were entirely clothed in white, and carried crosses or crucifixes, whence blood appeared to exude like sweat. They were headed by a priest, a foreigner, whom some affirm to have been a Spaniard, others a Provençal, others a Scotsman, and who affirmed himself to be Elias the Prophet, recently returned from Paradise. The awful announcement, which he was commissioned to make, was the immediate destruction

of the world by an earthquake; and his tale and his prophecy were eagerly received by a generation, educated in habits of religious credulity. Lombardy was the scene of his first exhortations; he traversed its cities and villages, followed by multitudes, who assumed at his bidding the cross, the raiment, and at least the show of repentance. From Lombardy he proceeded to the Ligurian Alps, and entered Genoa at the head of five thousand enthusiasts, natives of an adjacent town. They sang various new hymns in the form of litanies, and among them the celebrated *Stabat Mater dolorosa*, the reputed composition of St. Gregory: they passed several days in that city preaching peace, and then returned to their homes. The Genoese caught the contagion, and transmitted it onwards to Lucca and Pisa. Those of Lucca immediately proceeded, four thousand in number, to Florence, and, after being entertained by the public hospitality, departed. Then the Florentines adopted that new religion (as ecclesiastical writers designate it) with equal fervour; and thus was it propagated from one end of Italy to the other, till its course was at length arrested by the sea.

This pious frenzy was not confined to the lower classes, nor to the laity, nor even to the inferior orders of the clergy. Prelates and even cardinals are recorded to have followed, if they did not guide, the current; and the numerous procession from Florence was conducted by the Archbishop. And if, indeed, we are to believe the wonderful effects which are ascribed to the preaching of these fanatics, we shall scarcely censure the complaisance which countenanced, or at least which tolerated them. All who joined in those pilgrimages made confession and testified sincere repentance. Every one pardoned his neighbour, and dismissed the recollection of past offences; so that the work of charity was multiplied with zeal and emulation, and enmities, which no ordinary means could have reconciled, were put asleep. It was a festivity of general reconciliation. Ambuscades, assassinations, and all other crimes were for the season suspended; nor was any violence committed nor any treason meditated, so long as the "religion" of the White Penitents continued in honour. But this was not long; the imposture of the prophet was presently discovered and exposed, and within a very few months from the time of its appearance, the order fell into disregard, and wholly disappeared*.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Attempts of the Church at Self-Reformation.

General clamour for Reformation—with different objects—first appearance of a Reform party in the Church—exposure of Church abuses by individual Ecclesiastics—Pierre d'Ailli—Nicholas Clemangis—John Gerson—German and English Reformers—Zabarella—the real views and objects of those Ecclesiastics—how limited—position, exertions, and disappointment of the Council of Pisa—good really effected by it—Council of Constance—language of Gerson—The Committee of Reform—its labours—the question as to the priority of the Reformation or of the election of the new Pope—division of the Council—arguments on both sides—calumnies against the Germans—death of the Bishop of Salisbury—Address to the Emperor—defection of two Cardinals and of the English—final effort of the Germans—triumph of the Papal party—and election of Martin V.—necessary result of this—the principles and motives of the Italian clergy—The fortieth Session—object of the Reformers—the Eighteen Articles—remarks—other projects of the Committee—respecting the Court of Rome—their general character—respecting the secular Clergy—ecclesiastical jurisdiction—the

* The authors who have mentioned these enthusiasts, are Theodoric of Niem, an eyewitness, Poggio, in his *History of Florence*, Sigonius, Platina, Muratori.

monastic establishments—the real difference in principle between the two parties—first proceedings of Martin V.—fresh remonstrances of the nations—Sigismond's reply to the French—the Pope negotiates with the nations separately—publishes in the 43rd Session his Articles of Reformation—and soon afterwards dissolves the Council—the Concordats—character of the Pope's Articles—Annates—exertions of the French—the principle of the superiority of a General Council to the Pope established at Constance—decree for the periodical convocation of General Councils—assemblies of Pavia and Sienna—meeting of the *Council of Basle*—death of Martin V.—crisis of the Church—Accession of Eugenius IV.—his character—determines on opposition to the Council of Basle—the objects of that assembly—Cardinal Julian Cesarini—Contest between the Council and the Pope—two epistles of Cardinal Julian to the Pope—citations from them, on the corruption of the German clergy, on the popular discontent, on the transfer or prorogation of the Council, on the danger to the temporalities of the Church, on Eugenius' efforts to destroy the Council—political circumstances interrupt the dispute—the Pope sanctions the Council, and they proceed to the reformation of the Church—Substance of the chief enactments on that subject—against concubinage, fees paid at Rome—on papal election, &c.—some subsequent canons—Industry of the Pope's party in the Council—his successful negotiations at Constantinople—the quarrel renewed—the Pope assembles the Council of Ferrara—Secession of Cardinal Julian—his example not imitated—Differences about the legitimacy of the Council of Basle—the Cardinal of Arles—the eight propositions against Eugenius—strong opposition in favour of the Pope—he is deposed—Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, (Felix V.) appointed successor—dissolution of the Council—Nicholas V. succeeds Eugenius, and Felix abdicates—Diet of Mayence—The *Council of Bourges*—Pragmatic Sanction—its two fundamental principles—character of its leading provisions—its real permanence—The intended periodical meeting of General Councils—its probable effects on the condition of the Church—Ecclesiastical principles of the Councils of Constance and Basle—treatment of Huss and Jerome of Prague—Spiritual legislation of the Council of Basle—intolerance of those assemblies—Discovery of the art of printing.

THOUGH Churchmen are usually slow to perceive the corruptions of their own system, and unwisely dilatory and apprehensive in correcting them, still the abuses of the Roman Catholic Church were now become so flagrant—they had so commonly thrown off decency and shame—they were so wholly indefensible by reason or even by sophistry—and at the same time so oppressive and so unpopular, that a cry for Reformation began to be raised by the acknowledged friends, the ministers, and even the dignitaries of the communion. We intend no reference at this moment to the murmurs of those discontented spirits, who saw deeper into the iniquities of the system, and aimed their yet ineffectual resistance at its root—those faithful messengers of the Gospel, who prepared the way for Luther and Cranmer, but whose warnings were lost upon a selfish and short-sighted hierarchy. The exertions of Wickliffe and Huss, the real reformers of the Church, will be noticed hereafter: at present, we shall confine our attention to the endeavours, by which the wiser and more virtuous among her obedient children strove, through a considerable period, to remove her most repulsive deformities, and restore at least the semblance of health and dignity. We shall observe with curiosity and advantage the particular evils, to which the zeal of those reformers was directed, and the perverse and narrow and fatal policy which thwarted it. It is not that any effectual remedies could have been applied by those hands—nor any perfect renovation of their Communion accomplished by men, who were ignorant of the actual seat and character of the disease. The restoration of an Evangelical Church was not the object, nor could it have been the result, of their efforts; but the permanence of their own system was the matter really at stake—for it is very clear that the dominion of Rome would have been greatly strengthened by seasonable self-correction; and that an authority, so deeply fixed in the firmest prejudices of mankind, might have been preserved somewhat longer, had it been exercised with more discretion, and modified according to the changing principles of the times.

In our progress through the earlier annals of the Church, the shadow of reformation is continually before our eyes, and its name presents itself in every page—not only in the records of the monastic establishments, which

could not otherwise have been perpetuated, than by an unceasing process of regeneration, but also in the general regulations of Popes and of Councils. The necessity of new enactments, the pressure of existing abuses, the excellence of the ancient discipline were admitted in all ages, and the admission was sometimes followed by salutary legislation. Indeed, it is unquestionable, that those among the chiefs of the Church, who have best secured the gratitude of their own communion, as well as the commemoration of history, have deserved that distinction, not by a timid acquiescence in the defects of the existing institutions, but by a generous endeavour to correct them: so that the word at least was familiar and respectable in the eyes of Prelates and of Popes, and the principle might be avowed, under certain restrictions, without any suspicion, or even insinuation, of heresy.

The first occasion, however, on which the advocates of reform can be said to have appeared as a party in the Church, was the first assembly for the extinction of the schism. Among the Fathers of Pisa a powerful spirit of independence prevailed, and the circumstances of the preceding century had given it a direction and an object. There are, indeed, many earlier instances of the boldness of ecclesiastics in individually denouncing the imperfections of the Church, and in synodically legislating for their removal; but it was not till the secession to Avignon had lowered the majesty of Rome and impaired the resources of her Pontiffs; it was not till the division which followed had filled the world with proofs of their weakness and baseness, of their necessities, their vices, and their extortions—that a principle very hostile to papal despotism established itself, not only among princes and enlightened laymen, but even among the Prelates of the Catholic Church. Indeed, when

*General Complaints against
the abuses of the Church.*

we observe the language in which certain eminent ecclesiastical writers, during the conclusion of the 14th and the beginning of the following century, have exposed and stigmatized ecclesiastical disorders, our wonder will rather be, that the system, which they so boldly denounced, did not sink beneath the burden of its own sinfulness, than that persons, who were interested in its preservation should have combined to amend and restore it. Among these were men of the noblest character and most extended learning; men of all nations, and, during the schism, of all obediences; at the same time, they were persons attached to Popery and patronized by Popes. Among the *French*, Pierre d'Ailli, Cardinal of Cambrai, was a moderate, but earnest, advocate for reform; in his treatise* on that subject, written about 1410, he censured with great severity the luxurious insolence of his own order; and it was he who has retailed a proverb current in those days, 'that the Church had arrived at such a condition, as to deserve to be governed only by the reprobate†.' Nicholas of Clemangis, a native of Champagne, who had been secretary to Benedict XIII., in an address to the Council of Constance, ascribed the schism

* 'De difficultate Reformationis in Concilio Universali.' It was addressed to Gerson, in reply to the Treatise of the latter on the same subject. His more celebrated work was that 'De Ecclesiastica Potestate,' in which he gave his views of the origin of ecclesiastical, as well as of papal power, and of their relation to each other. It may be found in the 6th volume of Von der Hardt. He was born in Picardy in 1350, and both Gerson and Clemangis were his pupils. Bayle, Vie de Pierre d'Ailly.

† "Adeo ut jam horrendum quorundam proverbium sit, ad hunc statum venisse Ecclesiam, ut non sit digna regi nisi per reprobos." The passage is cited by Lenfant, Hist. Conc. Const., l. vii. s. 1.

and desolation of the Church to the frightful ungodliness of its pastors. 'The earliest ministers of the Gospel were devout, humble, charitable, liberal, disinterested, and they despised the good things of this world. But as riches increased, piety diminished; luxury, ambition, and insolence took the place of religion, humility, and charity: poverty became a disgrace, and economy a vice; avarice came to the aid and support of ambition; and the property of ecclesiastics being no longer sufficient for their desires, it grew into practice to seize that of others, to pillage, assault, and oppress the inferiors, and to plunder every one under every pretext.' Such being the substance of his general* censures, he did not hesitate more particularly to ascribe the first rank in vice and scandal to the Popes, 'When they saw, that the revenues of Rome and the patrimony of St. Peter were inadequate to their designs of aggrandisement, it became necessary to discover new resources for the support of that project of universal monarchy. And nothing could be conceived more lucrative, than to deprive metropolitans, bishops, and other ordinaries, of the right of election to benefices, and to reserve the nomination and collation to themselves: and these they never conferred, except for large sums of money; which they often obtained in advance, by granting expectative graces to all sorts of persons indiscriminately, or at least without any distinction in regard to capacity or morals.' Such was, in truth, the origin of the *Apostolic Chamber*; and the mysteries of that fiscal inquisition had, no doubt, been intimately revealed to the secretary of Benedict XIII. The last whom we shall mention, and the greatest among the reformers of France, was the Chancellor of the University of Paris, John Gerson. In a sermon delivered before the Council of Rheims in 1408, that eloquent Doctor exposed the vices of the clergy, with the same freedom which he afterwards† employed at Constance in defining the legitimate limits of Papal authority. From the exposure of the evil he proceeded to investigate its origin; and as the general degeneracy of every rank in the priesthood was commonly traced by the writers of that age to the licentiousness of the Roman Court, so any effort to purify the descending stream was reasonably directed to its supposed source.

If the most distinguished among the reforming party were natives of France, the *Germans* engaged in greater numbers, and with greater consistency, in the same project. They appear, moreover, to have been the

* Not that his censures were confined to the avarice and rapacity of the clergy; a considerable share of them is directed to their incontinence—for instance, 'Quid illud, obsecro, quale est? quod *plerisque* in Diocesisbus rectores parochiarum ex *certo* et conducto cum *suis Prælati* pretio passim et publicè Concubinas tenent? Quod subditorum excessus et vitia, omniaque officia, quæ judiciis præesse sunt solita, publicè venundant? Sed adhuc levia hæc sunt.' Nor was he more merciful to the canons and monks; he was even particularly severe on the insolence and vanity of the latter, whom he considered as the Pharisees of their age. Respecting the abominations committed in the nunneries, his expressions are strong and exaggerated. 'Nam quid, obsecro, aliud sunt hoc tempore puellarum monasteria, nisi quædam, non dico Dei sanctuaria, sed Veneris execranda prostibula, sed lascivorum et impudicorum Juvenum ad libidines explendas receptacula. Ut idem hodie sit puellam velare, quod ad publicè scortandum exponere.' (Nicol. de Clemangiis, de Ruina Ecclesiæ. cap. xxxvi. Apud Von der Hardt, tom. i. Conc. Constan.) Gerson, also, in his sermon at Rheims, used these words: 'Et utinam nulla sint Monasteria mulierum, quæ facta sunt prostibula meretricum, et prohibeat adhuc deteriora Deus.' Ser. factus in Concil. Remensi. Op. Gers., vol. ii., p. 626. Edit. Paris. See Lenfant, Conc. Const., l. vii., c. 13.

† In 1410 he addressed to Pierre d'Ailly his treatise 'De Modis Uniendi et Reformandi Ecclesiam in Concilio Universali.' His more celebrated work, 'De Simonia abolenda Constantiensis Concilii Ope,' was written during the Council. Both may be found in Von der Hardt, tom. i.

earliest in the field; for we observe, that Henry de Langenstein, of Hesse, a German, published in 1381 a vigorous treatise on 'the Union and Reformation of the Church*.' The five last chapters of his work were employed in depicting the universal profligacy of the clergy. After denouncing the simonies and other iniquities of the Popes, the Cardinals, and Prelates, he descended to expose the concubinage of the priests and the debaucheries of the monks; he represented the cathedrals as no better than dens of robbers, and the monasteries as taverns and brothels†. From England the voice of remonstrance proceeded with not less energy. 'The Golden Mirror of the Pope, his Court, the Prelates, and the rest of the Clergy‡,' was composed during the pontificate of Boniface IX., the most triumphant era of schism and simony; and the Treatise of Richard Ullerston, an Oxford Doctor, is said to have guided the views of the Bishop of Salisbury, who effectually served the cause by his personal zeal, both at Pisa and Constance. The *Italians*, as they were the only people who profited by pontifical corruption, so were they more commonly found to defend and uphold it. But even among them were a few splendid exceptions; Pileus§, Archbishop of Genoa, and Zabarella||, Cardinal of Florence, acknowledged and deplored the general unworthiness of the order to which they belonged. Lastly, even the *Spaniards* themselves, the perverse adherents of Benedict XIII., vented at Constance, in some satirical compositions, the indignation, which it was not yet politic to express openly.

We have thus seen how generally¶ it was admitted at that period, even by the friends and ministers of the Church, that great abuses existed

* 'Consilium Pacis de Unione ac Reformatione Ecclesie in Concilio Universali querenda.' It occupies sixty columns in the beginning of Von der Hardt's second volume.

† This reformer seems also to have looked somewhat more deeply into the question; for he beheld with dissatisfaction the great multitude of images, which he held to be so many incentives to idolatry; and he was offended by the multiplication of festivals, and the frivolous nature of the controversies which divided the Church.

‡ 'Aureum Speculum Papæ, ejus Curie, Prælatorum, aliorumque Spiritualium.' The work gained great celebrity on the Continent.

§ See his *Ingenua Parænesis* ad Sigismund. Imper. De *Reformatione Ecclesie in Conc. Const. proseguenda*, apud Von der Hardt, tom. i., part 15.

|| There still exists a long and elaborate Treatise, published by Zabarella, 'De Schismate Innocentii et Benedicti Pontificis,' either before the meeting of the Council of Pisa, or during its earliest deliberations.

¶ In the 'History of the Council of Constance,' by Theodoric Vrie, written at the time and dedicated to Sigismund, the Church herself is made to speak the following lines, more remarkable for the bold truths which they contain, than for delicacy of expression, or metrical correctness. (Lib. i. Metrum Secundum.)

Meu Simon regnat; per munera quæque reguntur,

Judiciumque pium gaza nefanda vetat.

Curia Papalis fovet omnia scandala mundi,

Delubra sacra facit perfiditate forum.

Ordo sacer, baptisma sacrum cum Chrismate Sancto

Venduntur, turpi conditione foro.

Dives honoratur, pauper contemnitur, atque

Qui dare plura valet munera gratus erat.

Aurea quæ quondam fuit, hinc argentea Papæ

Curia procedit deteriore modo.

Ferrea dehinc facta, dura cervicæ quievit

Tempore non modico; sed modo facta lutum.

Postque lutum quid deterius solet esse? Recordor—

Stercus. Et in tali Curia tota sædet.

Semler, in Cap. ii. Secul. xv., 'De Publico Ecclesiæ Statu,' enumerates a great multitude of compositions produced by the discontented spirits of the 14th and 15th centuries. Several are given at length by Herman Von der Hardt, *Hist. Concil. Constant.*

therein, that they demanded immediate and effectual correction, and that such could only be administered by removing the cause of the evil. Let us examine then, for one moment, the view which they took of their own imperfections. . . We may observe that the lamentations and censures, so abundantly poured forth by those writers, were confined almost wholly to one subject—the degeneracy and corruption of the clergy. This, indeed, was acknowledged to extend to the lowest rank from the very highest—this was admitted to comprise every form of sin and degradation—but this, according to their notions, was the limit of the evil. Under this one head was comprehended (or very nearly so) the sum and substance of the ecclesiastical derangement. The purity of the *system* was seldom or never questioned; the perfect integrity and infallible wisdom of the Church, and the divine obligation to believe and obey, without thought or question, all that it had enjoined or should enjoin, in practice, or precept, or ceremony, or discipline, was as strongly inculcated by the most eminent reformers, as by the most perverse upholders of the avowed abuses; only, it was maintained by the former, that the men, who administered this heaven-descended system, were sunk in a depravity from which it was necessary to raise them, and that no measures could effect this benefit, which did not first provide for the re-organization of the highest ranks. After all, it was but the surface of the subject which they surveyed; and thus the remedies proposed could not be other than ineffectual.

At the same time it must be admitted, that those remedies were properly adapted to the end which they were intended to attain. The demoralization of the inferior clergy was undoubtedly occasioned, in a very great measure, by the non-residence, the avarice, and the venality of their more elevated brethren; and these views were communicated almost necessarily by the contagion of the Court of Rome. And since it was become the practice of that Court to attract all aspiring ecclesiastics by the undisguised sale of the most honourable dignities, its malignant influence spread like a pestilence through the Church. Those, therefore, who maintained that no reform could have any effect unless it commenced at the head, and whose first endeavours were turned to extirpate the scandals of the Vatican, pursued their own views with boldness and sagacity, and aimed well to uproot the evil which they saw—only, their views were too narrow, and the evil lay deeper than they were able to discover, or than they dared to avow.

One professed object of the Council of Pisa was ‘to reform the Church in its head and in its members;’ and many of the fathers there assembled were earnest in that intention. We have seen, indeed, to what insufficient limits their project was confined: still was it no inconsiderable design in that age, nor unworthy of a bold and generous character, especially in ministers and prelates of the Roman Church, to repress the licentiousness, and to moderate the power, of the successor of St. Peter. The boldness of the enterprise may be measured by its difficulty; for, if it was little that the reformers attempted, it was much more than they had the means of accomplishing. The moment, however, was exceedingly favourable; and when, after the deposition of the two pretenders, the See was vacant, and the election about to be made under the very eyes of the Council, an oath was imposed upon the Cardinals, that he among them who should be raised to the Pontificate, should not dissolve the Council, until after the reformation of the Church had been completed. The choice of the College, directed by the counsels of Baltazar Cossa, fell upon Alexander V. Gerson pre-

sently preached before him, and did not omit to press the paramount duty of correcting many abuses. A great number of the fathers held the same expectation. But Alexander, who was a Greek and a Pope, had no design to diminish his own profitable privileges, nor any scruple in evading his solemn obligation. In the 22nd and 23rd Sessions he published certain declarations, that out of regard for the necessities of the Churches, he remitted all arrears due to the Apostolical Chamber; that he resigned henceforward his claim on the property of deceased Prelates, and the revenues of vacant bishoprics; that he would make no more transfers of benefices, without previously hearing the parties concerned; and that provincial councils should be more frequently assembled for the salutary regulation of the Church. The consideration of any extensive plan of reform he thought expedient to defer, until the next general Council; but this was to be assembled in three years.

With these unsubstantial concessions—and even from these there was one dissentient Cardinal,—the Prelates of Pisa were dismissed; and if they returned to their several Sees with the consciousness, that they had not fully accomplished any one of the objects for which they were convoked, yet were they not without consolation, nor were their labours without fruit. They had not, indeed, healed the divisions of the Church; they had not restrained the abuses of papal power; they had not checked the profligacy of the Cardinals; they had not imposed any limit on the spreading domination of simony. Nevertheless, they had fulfilled an important destiny in the declining history of their Church; they had proclaimed the supremacy of a general Council, and deposed the two disputants who divided the papacy; they had freely censured the vices of the Apostolical See, and had demanded its reformation; they had secured the early convocation of another Council for the remedy of their grievances; and lastly, and most especially, they had opposed to pontifical despotism that independent constitutional spirit, which was the safeguard of the ancient Church; and which spreading from Pisa to Constance, from Constance to Basle, and striking deeply, though latently, during the times of iniquity which succeeded, at length achieved, under happier auspices and in a bolder spirit, its great and effectual triumph.

A much more numerous congregation of prelates and ecclesiastics of every rank, of ambassadors, of doctors of law, and other distinguished laymen, constituted the august assembly of Constance. The place was favourable to the hopes *The Council of Constance.* of reform; for the German soil was more auspicious to that cause than the irreligious and interested cities of Italy. Accordingly, we observe that its necessity was more loudly proclaimed, and its principles defined with greater boldness and exactitude. Gerson once more led the assault against papal delinquency. He attacked the Decretals, the Clementines, and most of the constitutions of the Popes; he overthrew many of the pretensions thence derived, and he exposed, in a strain now familiar to his audience, their simony, their avarice, and anti-Christian usurpations*. 'All the bulls of John begin with a falsehood;

* 'Non Christi, sed mores gerunt Antichristi;' and again, 'Non legimus Christum illi contulisse potestatem beneficia, dignitates, episcopatus, villas, terras dispensandi aut distribuendi, sed nec unquam legimus Petrum hæc fecisse. Sed solum hanc potestatem ei tribuit specialem, scriptam *Matt. xvi.*, quam etiam minimo mundi episcopo concessit.' Such expressions might be flattering to the dignity of the surrounding prelates. But he was an injudicious friend to the Roman Catholic Church, who appealed to the Bible as the test of its purity. John Huss, had he been present at this discourse, might have pressed that argument somewhat farther.

for, if he was truly the *servant of the servants of God*,* he would employ himself in rendering service to the faithful, and assisting the poor, who are the members of Christ Jesus. But so far is he from calling the poor about him, or persons distinguished for their learning or their virtue, that he surrounds himself with lords, and tyrants, and soldiers. Let him, then, rather assume the title of Lord of Lords; since he dares to boast, that he possesses the same power which Christ possessed in his divine and human nature*. It was well, indeed, for Gregory the Great to call himself the *Servant of the Servants of God*. He nourished the poor, and was poor himself; he conferred benefices only on men of virtue and capacity; he preached the Gospel himself to his clergy and his people; he composed works to confirm believers in their faith; he held a rein over the luxury of the Roman people, and rescued them by his prayer to God from a pernicious pestilence. . . . Accustomed to the bitterness of such taunts, the Pope and his luxurious court may have been insensible to their shamefulness, or even questioned their justice; but, among the mitred multitudes who were present, some were doubtless awakened by the eloquence of Gerson to a better sense of their faith, their duties, and their obedience.

The Council had not been many months in existence before it entered seriously into this department of its duties; and a Committee of Reform (*Collège Réformatoire*) was appointed to examine into particular abuses, and prepare a general project for the approbation of the whole assembly. This College, named on the 15th of June, 1415, was composed of nineteen persons, viz. four deputies from each of the four nations, and *three Cardinals*. The deputies were chosen indifferently

The College of Reform. from bishops, doctors in theology, and doctors in law. There had been some previous contest, whether or not the Cardinals should be at all admitted as members of this body; since it was now well understood by all parties, that the question of a general reform practically resolved itself into a reform of the Court of Rome: not only because any other measures would have been wholly useless, unless attended by that, but also because the whole opposition to the removal of abuses proceeded from that quarter. Of the three

* 'Quia præsumit dicere esse tantam suam potestatem, quantam Christus habuit, secundum quod Deus et secundum quod homo.' Opera Gersoni, Apud Leafant, Hist. Conc. Const. l. vii. s. xiv. The same doctor, in his sermon, 'De Signis Ruinæ Ecclesiæ,' mentions eight such indications: (1.) Rebello et inobedientia; (2.) Inverecundia; (3.) Immoderata inæqualitas, qua alius et sæpe dignior esurit; alius et frequenter indignior præ multitudinem et magnitudine beneficiorum ebrius est; (4.) Fastus et superbia prælatorum et aliorum ecclesiasticorum—tantus fastus in Dei Ecclesia, præcipue in temporibus istis, non tam multos movet ad reverentiam quam multos ad indignationem; et plures invitat ad prædā, qui se reputarent fortasse Deo sacrificium offerre, si possent quosdam divites ecclesiasticos spoliare; (5.) Signum sumitur ex tyrannide præsidium—tales sunt pastores qui non pascunt gregem Domini sed semetipsos; (6.) Conturbatio principum et commotio populorum; (7.) Recusatio correctionis in principibus ecclesiæ; (8.) Novitas opinionum. Moderno quidem tempore unusquisque interpretari et trahere non veretur sacram scripturam, jura, sanctorumque patrum instituta ad libitum suæ voluntatis, prout amor, odium, invidia, spes promotionis, aut vindicta eum inclinat. . . . : Præter hæc sunt alia signa, videlicet recessus justitiæ, distinctio studiorum, prælato puerorum, et ignorantium et pravorum, et hæc erit destructio Latinorum. Plura alia sunt descripta in Prophetis de dejectione sacerdotalis honoris, ex quibus et prædictis, sapiens potest concludere ruinam temporalium de propinquo imminere. A multis annis non fuerunt tot malevoli, tanti corde rebelles et animo accensi contra ecclesiam sicut his diebus. Quos in longum compescere nequaquam valebimus, nisi signis virtutum manifestis ad benevolentiam eos inclinaverimus.' Gersoni Opera, vol. i. p. 199, Ed. Paris, 1606. This sermon was preached before the Council of Constance.

interested parties who were at length admitted into the committee, Pierre d'Ailli, the Cardinal of Cambrai, was one.

The Colledge appears to have held its first deliberations on the 20th of August; and the subject to which they were directed was the translation of bishops. Other important matters were discussed by it during the autumn following; but whether it was paralyzed by the pontifical intrigues, or whether some of its members were deficient in zeal, its exertions did not keep pace with the eagerness of the reformers without. The German 'Nation' published, about the end of the year, a remonstrance against the tediousness of its proceedings; the pulpits of Constance resounded with expressions of exhortation and reproof; and elegies, and squibs, and satires were circulated to the same effect in the social, and even in the public, meetings of the fathers.

The labours of the committee were continued through the whole of 1416 till late in the succeeding year; and by that time, as we shall see presently, they had produced many wise and salutary resolutions. But in the course of 1417 a new subject of controversy arose, which deeply affected the success of those measures. As soon as the See, through the cession or deposition of its three claimants, was declared vacant, a very important question was moved—whether it were not wise to defer the new election, until after the work of reformation should have been accomplished. Whatever was honest and intelligent and dispassionate in the party of the reformers maintained the necessity of that expedient. They knew the ambitious and selfish spirit of papacy; they knew how the elevation to the apostolical chair could blight the best principles, and contract the noblest heart; they knew that disinterested integrity in that situation was beyond the magnanimity of man. They determined not to

Divisions, ending in the election of Martin V.

create with their own hands a destroyer of their own works. The nations, which took this side in the dispute, were the Germans and the English, and they were supported with the utmost sincerity and firmness by the Emperor. The Cardinals conducted the opposite party with equal constancy and greater craft: they were warmly supported by the Italians; the Spaniards, who on the deposition of Luna had been admitted to the deliberations, were on the same side; and even the French, hitherto the most enlightened advocates of reform*, for the most part, threw themselves into the ranks of its opponents. The contest continued during the whole summer—numerous harangues were delivered, and much violence and much sophistry was wasted on both sides. On the one hand, the universal deformity and prostitution of the Church were exhibited and exaggerated in the most furious invectives; on the other, it was argued that the Church without the Pope was a headless trunk, which was indeed the most frightful of all deformities; and that it became, in consequence, the first duty of every reformer to supply that deficiency (such was the nonsense seriously propounded by the friends of corruption) and thus restore the spiritual body to its integrity.

This was indeed the last ground of hope which remained to the cardinals; and it was really firm and tenable, because the majority of the nations had declared in their favour. They contested it with every weapon, and with the uncompromising, unscrupulous activity of men, whose personal interests were concerned in the result. On one occasion

* This sudden change is ascribed to their national jealousy of the English, the victory of Agincourt.

they presented a memorial to Sigismond, in which they urged, on the plea of their majority, their right to proceed to immediate election: at the same time they affected to repel, with some loftiness, the imperial interference in matters strictly ecclesiastical. On another, they published an offensive libel upon the Germans, in which they accused that nation of a disposition to favour the opinions of the Hussites—to defer the election of a Pope, in order to reform, without his co-operation, his office and his court, savoured strongly (so the cardinals argued) of the anti-papal perversion of those heretics! The stigma of heresy—a weapon which the defenders of ecclesiastical abuses have managed with great address in every age of the Church—exasperated those honest and orthodox Christians, and they repelled it with great, and (as they thought) virtuous indignation. About the same time Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury, died. He was among the stoutest of the Reformers of Constance, and had exercised very considerable influence, not only over the councils of his compatriots, but over the mind of the Emperor himself*.

On the 9th of September, five days after his decease, an assembly was held on the same subject; and the result was a remonstrance, in the name of the cardinals, to Sigismond, on the extreme danger impending over the Church from any delay in the election of a Pope. It is remarkable, that the language of this document expressed a sense of the necessity of reform, and great readiness to undertake it; but it was urged, that the question ought to be deferred, until a head had been given to the Church. But the Emperor rose ere the Address was finished, and indignantly quitted the Assembly. Howbeit, the cardinals persisted, without any fear or compromise; two days afterwards, a second † memorial, more explicit and decided than the former, was presented and read; and so firm was the attitude of that party, that the only two members of the sacred college, who had hitherto supported the opposite opinions, now joined their colleagues. A still more important defection immediately followed this; the English also passed over to the papal party.

From the moment that the decision of the majority of the Council was contravened by Sigismond, it was very easy to persuade even the most honest reformers, that the dignity and authority of the whole assembly was at stake, and that it was the duty of all parties to combine, in order to repel the presumptuous interference of the Emperor—and many were probably influenced in their change by that motive. But the Germans still maintained their former resolution; and though many of them also may have been guided by considerations (of nationality, or loyalty) foreign to the original question of reform, a fresh memorial, which they immediately presented to the Council, pressed very forcibly the real argument on which the contest now turned. In this paper they maintained, with great boldness and reason, ‘that the General Council stood in the place of the Church and completely represented it; that the schism had arisen from the general corruption of that body, and that such corruption could only be remedied during the vacancy of the See; that if a Pope were once elected—however virtuous and upright the individual exalted might be, however proved and old in integrity and piety—he would speedily be stained by the vices which infected the Chair, and debased the ecclesiastics surrounding it; that he would grope in the darkness. and

* Von der Hardt calls him Cæsar's *fidus Achates*.

† They may both be found in the first volume of Von der Hardt's *Hist. Cons. Constat. Præfat.* in part. xx. p. 916 et seq.

solitude of his own honesty, till his private excellence would give way before the overwhelming depravities of a system, which no man could possibly administer, and be virtuous,—while, on the other hand, a substantial reform, previously effected, would shelter him from the pressure of unjust and wicked solicitations.' The wisdom and truth contained in these positions inflamed still further the perversity of the cardinals; and what they could not hope to effect by reason, or even by menace, they prepared to accomplish by more certain means. Among the German prelates there were two, who possessed, more completely than their brethren, the confidence both of the Emperor and the 'Nation'—the Archbishop of Riga and the Bishop of Coire. Each of these respectable persons had private reasons (which were not concealed from the cardinals) for being discontented with his own See. A negotiation was opened. To the former they promised the bishopric of Liege, which he coveted; to the latter, the archbishopric of Riga—both were converted. Their compatriots followed them; and the tumults, which had shaken the Council for so many months, were appeased by the translation of two venal prelates*.

The Emperor, thus deserted by the entire Church, still offered an ineffectual show of resistance; and at length, to throw at least some dignity over his defeat, he stipulated as the conditions of his consent, that the Pope should enter, without any delay, even before his coronation, upon the work of reform; that he should conduct it in concert with the Council; and that he should not depart from Constance, until his task was accomplished. The cardinals, with their coadjutors†, soon afterwards assembled in conclave, and on the 11th of November following, Martin V., an Italian and a Roman, was raised to the pontifical throne.

The historian cannot fail to perceive, what was indeed obvious at the time to the most intelligent men of both parties, that the battle of reform had in fact been fought on other ground, and that the field, for which so many efforts had been made, and were still to be made, was already lost. Some nominal improvements might yet, perhaps, be extorted from the reluctant pontiff—some trifling abuses he might be brought to sacrifice, in order to save and perpetuate the rest—with some unmeaning shadow he might consent to amuse and delude the world—but the hope of any substantial measure of renovation was gone. Notwithstanding the strong sense of the Church's degradation and danger, with which so many of the fathers were deeply penetrated—notwithstanding the security and even applause, with which their complaints and invectives were uttered and heard—notwithstanding the learning, the virtue, and the powerful talents which were united in the same cause,—it was no difficult matter for a small body of very crafty ecclesiastical politicians, closely bound together by common and personal interests, and wholly unscrupulous as to means, to neutralize the exertions of a much more numerous party, which, though earnestly bent on one general purpose, might be divided as to a thousand particulars. For a space of nearly three years numberless causes of discord, personal, professional, national, might spring up, while the watchful cardinals were ever at hand to encourage and mature them. Every change of circumstance presented a new field of action; and in so harassing and protracted a contest, superior discipline, and a keener sense of interest, might finally supplant or wear away the adverse majority.

Moreover, the College could always count, with perfect confidence, on

* Von der Hardt, tom. iv. p. 1426.

† See the preceding chapter, page 538.

the zeal and fidelity of its Italian allies. The whole multitude of the Transalpine clergy conspired, with scarcely an individual exception, in opposition to reform. Yet this combination did not, probably, arise, either

The Italian Clergy. because they were very rich, or very powerful, or very generally demoralized. *In riches*, the bishops and abbots of Italy could bear no comparison with the lordly hierarchy of Germany or England; partly, because their disproportionate numbers diminished the share of each in the common fund, and partly, because the private devotion of antient days had there been less munificent than among the younger and ruder proselytes of the north. *In power*, and popular influence, they were precluded from any extravagant progress by the wider diffusion of intelligence, and the free and daring spirit of the prevalent republicanism. In truth, among the Italian *people*, the last sparks of religious fervor were at this time nearly extinct; and whatever attachment they still retained for their Church was without enthusiasm, and not uncommonly without faith. The venerable family of Saints, once so fruitful in every province, was now rarely and languidly propagated. The din of polemical controversy, the surest indication of theological zeal, was seldom heard; and even *heresy* itself, which was building its indestructible temples in the north and west of Europe, gave little occupation or solicitude to the Churchmen of Italy. Many of the causes which tend generally to swell sacerdotal authority (we are not now speaking of the peculiar dominion of the Pope) had ceased to operate in that country. *In morality*, the Italian clergy were upon the whole less dissolute than those to the North of the Alps; and for that reason they were less deeply impressed with the necessity of reform. To this praise the Court of Rome did, indeed, present an infamous exception. But the pontifical palace may seem to have attracted to its own precincts most of the noxious vapours, which else would have spread more general infection; and the prelates of Italy found their profit in the very vices of Rome. Besides, they had been so long habituated to consider the authority of that See as national property, and shared with such selfish exultation the glory of its foreign triumphs and the sense of its imposing majesty, that they rallied round it with ardour, on the first rumour of hostility. They saw that some of its dearest prerogatives were threatened—they saw that some of its most profitable usurpations were assailed: but they did not see the FRIENDLINESS of the design—they did not perceive that an increase of vigour and stability would assuredly follow the immediate sacrifice:—they snatched at the short-sighted policy of the moment, and, by defending the abuses of their Church, ensured its downfall.

On the 30th of October, in the interval between the triumph of the cardinals and the election of the Pope, the fortieth, one of the most important sessions of the Council, took place. Then was made a very seasonable effort, on the part of the reformers, to impose some specific obligation upon the future Pope; and on this occasion the scheme, which the Committee of Reform had been so long engaged in preparing, was formally approved, and recommended to the immediate adoption of

the pontiff and Council—for the majority were
of Reformation. still sincere in their intentions, though they
had blindly cast away the means of effecting

them. To do justice to this subject, we must shortly mention the heads of this project; since it may be considered as embracing the utmost extent of change which it was thought expedient, or found possible, under

any circumstances to introduce. The Articles, to which the future reformation was to be directed, were eighteen:—(1) The number, the quality, and the nation of the cardinals; (2) The Reservations of the Holy See; (3) Annates; (4) Collations of benefices and expectative graces; (5) What causes ought to be treated in the Court of Rome; (6) Appeals to the same Court; (7) The offices of the Chancery and Penitentiary; (8) Exemptions granted, and unions made, during the schism; (9) Commendams; (10) The confirmation of elections; (11) Intermediates, *i. e.* revenues during vacancy; (12) Alienation of the property of the Roman and other Churches; (13) In what cases a Pope may be corrected and deposed, and by what means; (14) The extirpation of Simony; (15) Dispensations; (16) Provision for the Pope and the Cardinals; (17) Indulgences; (18) Tenths. To these it should be added, that, in the session preceding, a Decree had passed to regulate, and secure, as far as possible, the periodical meeting of General Councils.

In the resolutions, which the Committee published respecting the above Articles, a sort of principle is discernible, of throwing aside the new canon law, and reviving in its place the more discreet and venerable institutions of more antient days. Thus they resolved, that the Popes should judge no important cause without the counsel of his Cardinals—and even, in some instances, without the approbation of a General Council. And again, that there were certain cases in which a Pope might be judged and deposed—decisions wholly at variance with the canons of the Vatican, which committed to the Pope alone all judgment of major causes, and gave authority to Bulls, originating with himself; and which also laid it down, that a Pope could not be judged or deposed on any other charge, than that of heresy.

The Committee of Reform also prohibited the Popes from reserving* the *spoils* of the bishops, the revenues of vacant benefices, and the *procurations*, or provisions made for bishops during their visitations. *Regarding the Pope.* It imposed some restraint on pluralities and dispensations. The Pope was forbidden to permit the same person to hold more than one bishopric or abbey at the same time, unless with the consent of the sacred college, and for important reasons—though even this restriction appears to have been liable to exceptions, in countries especially where the benefices were poor†. Another resolution enforced the residence of the higher clergy, on pain of deprivation in case of six months of absence, unless with special permission from the Pope. Another forbade the Pope to impose tenths on his clergy, without the consent of a General Council. Another revoked, with some trifling exceptions, all the exemptions which had been granted during the schism. The abuse of exemptions had,

* On the subject of reservations, Lenfant remarks, that *Mental* Reservations of benefices were not yet introduced. These differed from others in that they were not published. If a benefice was vacant, and either the ordinary had conferred it, or any one went to Rome to obtain it, the datary would answer, that the Pope had made a mental reservation to present it to whom he thought proper.

† In Apulia, for example, and in some parts of Spain, the reformers allowed the Pope to give dispensation for four benefices. In England, on the other hand, they would not permit it, on any account, to be granted for more than two. Clemangis asserts (*De Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu*, cap. xi.) 'that there were at that time ecclesiastics who held as many as five hundred ample benefices.' And the same writer further affirms, 'that the monks of his day were at the same time monks, canons, regular, secular; that, under the same habit, they possessed the rights, offices, and benefices of all orders and of all professions.' *Lenf. Hist. Conc. Const.*, l. vii. s. xxxii.

indeed, proceeded so far as to awaken the conscience even of the Pope himself, who subsequently ratified this Article.

The popes had usurped the power of translating from see to see, without consulting the inclination of the prelates affected by the change. These forcible translations were prohibited by the committee; but it does not appear that Martin V. consented even to so slight an encroachment upon his despotism. It had also been a custom, probably established by Innocent III., for the Popes to reserve to the Holy See the power of giving absolution for certain offences (called reserved cases), which were thought to be placed above episcopal cognizance. The pretext for this innovation was, to invest those crimes with additional terrors, and to repel men from their commission by the difficulty of obtaining absolution. The common effect was this; that many, unable or indisposed to undertake so long a pilgrimage, disregarded entirely both confession and penance; while others, whose easier circumstances permitted the journey, poured forth their penitential gold with great profusion into the apostolical coffers. This subject was for some time debated in the committee; but it was at length unanimously decided, that the established usage should remain.

As those, here mentioned, composed the most important restrictions, which it was designed to impose upon the Pope's authority, so the meditated reform of his cardinals and his court

The Court of Rome, would have introduced changes still less considerable. Four resolutions were passed respecting the number of the sacred college, and the qualifications necessary for admission; as also, that every new nomination should receive the approbation of the majority of the college. Others were enacted for the better administration of the apostolical chancery and chamber, respecting protonotaries and participants; the auditors, or judges *della rota* (the parliament of the Pope); scriptors of the penitentiary; abbreviators of Bulls; clerks of the chamber; correctors of the apostolical letters; *auditores contradictatorium*, and auditors of the chamber; acoluthes, subdeacons, chaplains, referendaries, penitentiaries, and registrars—not for the abolition of any of those offices*, or of others which might have been added to the list, but only for their more judicious regulation. Thus we observe, that it did not then enter into the views of any party to diminish the state and dignity of the see, nor to curtail any of the consequence which it might derive from those circumstances; but that the Reformers of those days would have been well satisfied in that matter, had the Pope consented to part with the most obvious and superficial abuses.

The resolutions of the committee respecting the secular clergy, while they proclaimed the general corruption, were more especially levelled against two crimes, the same which, from the days of Gregory VII., had been the constant mark for the shafts of Reform—simony and concubinage. The enactments which were made, particularly against the former of these offences, were reasonable and salutary. But there could be little prospect of their execution, so long as the court of Rome was left in possession of so much pomp and splendour, without any fixed and sufficient funds for its support. Even had it been possible by a single act of the

* The only office, as far as we can observe, which the reformers abolished, was the 'Auditorship of the Chamber of Avignon,' which, since the return of the Pope's to Rome, had become an obvious sinecure.

council, at once to extirpate simony from the Church, Rome was the hot-bed where it would of necessity have sprung up again, and thence spread its pestiferous branches over the whole surface of Christendom. Other ecclesiastical abuses were likewise assailed. It had frequently happened*, to the great scandal of the people, that bishops held sees, and incumbents parishes, without having taken priest's orders. The College of Reform had already regulated, that the pope should grant no dispensation to bishops, on this point, for longer than one year: it extended the same limit to the inferior clergy. Another, and very important task it also undertook,—to draw the limits which were hereafter to divide civil from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to specify the causes which appertained to either. The want of some definite arrangement on this subject had, for some time, disturbed the course of justice, and led to perpetual broils between the clergy and the laity. Nevertheless, as it was through that very indistinctness, that the former had been enabled to push their claims so far, it might be uncertain whether its removal, though finally advantageous to both parties, would be very popular among them. Several useful regulations were likewise devised for the purification of the various religious bodies, and especially of the Mendicants. It seems, indeed, to have been generally admitted by the leading reformers, that in the universal degeneracy of the Church, the most conspicuous instances of profligacy and profaneness were exhibited by the monastic establishments.

Such are the outlines of the project† by which the reformers of Constance proposed to restrain the abuses of papacy, and to restore, correct, and consolidate the Catholic Church. And here we should again remark, that the authors of that project were themselves zealous, and even bigoted churchmen. Respecting the divine authority, the power, the infallibility‡ of the Church, they professed opinions as lofty, as the loftiest notions of their adversaries. Still the space which divided the two parties was broad and clear, and it was included in one question—In what does this infallible Church consist? In what is it fully and faithfully represented? Does a council-general, without the Pope, possess the mighty attributes in question? Or a council-general with the Pope? or the Pope without a council-general? The last opinion, the extreme of high papacy, had not perhaps very many advocates; at least the second was that on which the Italians took their stand, as being the more tenable; the first was the rallying principle of the reformers, who may be designated the low papists. It cannot be too carefully impressed, that the mighty struggles at Constance respected, in as far as *principles* were concerned, not the character of the Church, on which all were agreed, but the extent to which the Pope possessed the attributes of the Church. And this distinction being rightly understood, we shall find no difficulty in accounting—when we shall arrive at that subject—for the seeming inconsistency, with which the council of Constance deposed a legitimate Pope with one hand, while it consigned the heretics, Huss and Jerome, to barbarous execution with the other.

We have observed, that at the Fortieth Session eighteen articles, which

* Lenfant, Hist. Conc. Const., liv. vii., s. 46.

† The above account is founded on four authentic documents published by M. Von der Hardt, from the MSS. of the library of Vienna, and recognized by Lenfant as "containing all the resolutions of the committee of reform."—Hist. Conc. Constan., liv. vii., s. xxvii. See Von der Hardt, tom. i., partes x. xi. xii. *Collegii Reformatorem Constant. statuta, sive Geminum Reformatorii Constant. Protocolum, &c. &c.*

‡ It is only necessary to refer to the writings of leading reformers, Gerson, Pierre d'Ailli, &c., and the acts of the councils both of Constance and Basle.

were the heads of the resolutions of the committee, were submitted, by the approbation of the council, to the future Pope, and that Martin V, was elected a few days afterwards. Again, on the very day following his coronation, the nations assembled and pressed the observance of his obligation. The Pope appears to have promised with great facility; but at the same time he appointed six cardinals to co-operate with the deputies of the nations in revising their former labours. Divisions presently arose; the cardinals were indefatigable in creating difficulties; so that the patience of the Germans being once more wearied, they addressed (about the end of 1417) a fresh memorial to the new committee. The subjects urged on this occasion principally regarded reservations, appointment to benefices, expectative graces, and other papal usurpations, and abuses of the Church patronage. Very soon afterwards, the French remonstrated with equal warmth against the procrastinations of the committee, and even presented a petition to Sigismond, in which they exhorted him to employ his powerful influence with the Pope. But Sigismond had not forgotten their late opposition, nor was he unmindful of the fatal wound, which they had inflicted on the cause. He dismissed their deputies without honour; and while he bade them reflect, how steadily they had thwarted his wish to accomplish the reformation *before* the Pope should be elected, he recommended them, now that they had obtained their Pope, to apply to *him* for their reform. At the same time, the Spaniards raised a clamour against simony and other abuses, and went so far as to throw out some menaces against the Pontiff himself; indeed some of them were suspected of still harbouring a secret attachment towards their perverse compatriot, the Pope of Paniscola. Martin was somewhat moved by this show of unanimity; and thinking to gain better terms by dividing his adversaries, he contrived to open a separate negotiation with each nation, on the plea that he could thus more intimately consult their several interests. The scheme succeeded; and as all parties were wearied alike with dispute and delay, matters were now hurried to a conclusion. On the 21st of March, 1418, the Pope, no longer disguising his eagerness to dissolve the council, held the 43d session, and published his own articles of reformation; and they should be recorded for their very insignificance. The first revoked (with a large field for exceptions) such exemptions as had been granted *during the schism*; the second commanded a fresh examination of such unions of benefices as had taken place during the same period. The third prohibited the appropriation of the revenues of vacant benefices to the apostolical chamber. The fourth was a general edict against simony. The fifth respected papal dispensations to hold benefices without being in orders. The sixth forbade the imposition of tenths and other taxes on ecclesiastics, unless for some great advantage to the Church, and with the consent of the cardinals and local prelates. The seventh regulated the dress of ecclesiastics, according to the modesty of the antient laws; and the last, and the most shameless of all, declared that, by the above articles, and by the concordats granted to the nations, the Pope had satisfied the demands of the Committee of reform, as expressed in the fortieth session of the council, and discharged his own obligations.

The Concordats were as delusive as the articles*; and Martin, con-

* That granted to the Germans contained twelve articles, which are enumerated by Semler, *Secul. xv.*, cap. ii., p. 38. Since they did not go to the effectual removal of any grand abuse, it is unnecessary to cite them here.

sious of this, had not yet made them public; but continued to press the immediate dissolution of the council. It was in vain objected, that many matters of great importance still remained unsettled: it was replied, that the patrimony of the Holy See was in the hands of depredators; that Rome itself was exposed to the scourges of famine and pestilence, of foreign and intestine war; that it was the paramount duty of him, whom the whole world now acknowledged as the successor of St. Peter, to place himself on the throne of the apostle. Accordingly, on the 22d of April, the council assembled for the forty-fifth and last session; and the Bull which released the fathers from their unsuccessful labours, showered upon them and their domestics a profusion of indulgences, as if to complete, by an additional mockery, the insult with which their hopes had been destroyed*. On the 2d of May the concordats were published; and that which was granted to the French was immediately rejected by them, as contrary to the liberties of the Gallican Church. But the object of Martin was already accomplished; *the Council of Constance had ceased to exist*; and in defiance of the urgent remonstrances of the emperor, the pontiff turned his footsteps towards Italy. He turned towards the soil, where papacy was national and indigenous, and where, amidst all the turbulence of contending cities and factions, the spiritual despotism of the Vicar of Christ had never yet been contested.

Dissolution of the Council.

We should here observe that, while very lofty language was employed at Constance on both sides respecting the principle on which the government of the Church rested; while some maintained that it was a pure monarchy, others that it was a monarchy tempered by a mixture of the aristocratical and even republican character; other disputes were less publicly, though not less passionately, agitated between those parties, respecting much more vulgar con- *Disputes on Annates.* siderations. The reader cannot fail to have remarked, that of the concessions made by Martin, those which were not absolutely nugatory regarded the temporalities of the Church, and the power of the Pope to levy contributions upon the clergy. The reforming prelates had pressed these from the beginning among other grievances; but it proved at last, that the subject, on which those pecuniary discussions had chiefly turned, was entirely unnoticed in the Pope's decree. The exaction of *Annates*, or the first year's income of vacant benefices, seems to have

* As this memorable Bull happens to be short, it will be well to record it. 'We Martin, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, ad perpetuam rei memoriam, by the requisition of the holy council, do hereby dismiss and declare it terminated, giving to every one liberty to return home. Besides, by the authority of God the omnipotent, and of his blessed apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and by our own, we accord to all the members of the council plenary absolution from all their sins, "semel in vita;" so that each among them may obtain this absolution in form, within two months after the gift shall be made known to him. We also give them the same privilege in articulo mortis; and we extend it to servants as well as their masters, on condition that, after the day of notification, both the one and the other shall fast every Friday during one year, for the absolution for life, and another year for the absolution in articulo mortis; unless there be some legitimate hindrance, in which case they shall perform other pious works. And after the second year, they shall be held to fast every Friday during life, or to do other works of piety, on pain of incurring the indignation of the omnipotent God, and of his blessed apostles St. Peter and St. Paul.' Such were the consolations which were offered to the most enlightened body which had ever yet assembled in the name of the Church, in return for their disappointed expectations, by the very man whom they had raised to power, and whose first use of it was to betray them. They demanded a substantial reform, and he paid the debt in indulgences.

been that, among all the resources of the apostolical chancery, which was most profitable to the receivers, and most unpopular among all other ecclesiastics. The claim was of a very modern date; it could not be traced higher than Clement V.; and it scarcely assumed the shape of a right till the pontificate of Boniface IX. The French 'nation' urged the abolition of this tax with especial zeal from the very opening of the council; and the ambassador of Charles VI. was instructed at all events to carry this measure. The fathers, in a general assembly, even passed a resolution to that effect; but the cardinals still exclaimed and remonstrated, and protested; and, as their last resource, they ventured to appeal from the council to the future Pope. The French replied to this appeal with much spirit and reason*; and had the reformation preceded the election, there can be no doubt that the imposition would have been removed. But the cardinals finally prevailed, and the odious exaction, under some slight and indefinite restrictions, was re-established.

But though the reforming party, which really constituted the great majority of the Council, was finally defrauded of all the substance of its project, and dismissed with a very thin veil to cover its defeat, yet the recollection of one great triumph might supply substantial ground of consolation. The superiority of a General Council to the Pope was unequivocally decreed at Constance. The prelates of Pisa had done little more than overthrow two claimants to the See, neither of whom was universally acknowledged, or rightfully established. But the legitimacy of John XXIII. was never questioned even by his bitterest enemies; and Martin, whose succession to the dignity was only legal through the legality of the previous deposition and of the power exercised by the deposing Council, was the least qualified of all men to discredit either the act or the authority; so that, whatsoever struggles and protestations may afterwards have been made by individual Popes, the general principle was immutably established in the Church†.

The fathers of Constance also carried home with them another source of comfort and hope. In the thirty-ninth session, held on the 9th of October,

1417, it was enacted, as a perpetual law of the Church, that general councils should be held on every tenth year from the termination of the preceding; in such places as the Pope, with the consent of the Council sitting, should appoint.

Decree for the decennial meeting of General Councils.

But in the first instance, as the actual exigencies of the Church did not seem to allow even that short interval, another Council was to be assembled in five years from the dissolution of that of Constance, and a third in seven years after the second. In obedience to this constitution, Martin V. twice attempted to collect an obsequious assembly in Italy; but his summons were disregarded by the foreign prelates, to whom neither Pavia nor Sienna offered any prospect of independence. The scanty synods were hastily dissolved, and the only act which is recorded of the latter was to grant as ample indulgences to those, who should contribute gold for the extinction of the Bohemian heretics, as to those, who

* The substance of the paper is given by the Continuator of Fleury, l. civ., s. lxxiv. Some curious particulars of the dispute between the French and the Cardinals on the subject of Annates may be found in Von der Hardt, tom. i., pars xiii.

† It is well known that Transalpine divines dispute the principle even to this moment; but they have no ground to stand upon. If they admit the legitimacy of the Council of Constance, they must receive that decision; if not, they impugn the succession of their Popes ever since that Council—for they all flow uninterruptedly from Martin V. No sophistry can liberate them from this dilemma.

should serve *the crusade* in person. Basle, at length, was appointed for the meeting of the real representatives of the Church, and they crowded thither in great multitudes during the spring and summer of 1431.

In the meantime, on the 19th of the preceding February, Martin V. died. His long pontificate had been principally devoted to two objects, the recovery of the States of the Church and the amassing of wealth; and he had succeeded in both. As to *Council of Basle*, the former, he had restored the interests of the See nearly to the condition in which they stood before the schism. As to the latter, he destined the treasures, which he collected, rather for the aggrandizement of his own family, than for the benefit of the Catholic Church, or even of the Pontifical Government. At the same time, it is admitted that he possessed considerable talents, and a vigorous and consistent character; and he has escaped the imputation of any great vice, excepting avarice. At this crisis, the character of the successor to the chair was of consequence almost incalculable to the Church. The Council of Basle was irrevocably summoned; and its principles, its policy, and its power could easily be foreseen from the experience of Constance. What policy, then, was the new Pope to pursue? Was he openly to oppose, or craftily to elude, or generously to co-operate, in the work of reformation? The durability of the Roman Catholic Church depended on the answer.

The Cardinals were not, indeed, disturbed by such distant considerations; and the views, with which most of them entered the conclave, extended not beyond their private intrigues or immediate interests. Being unable at once to agree, they proceeded to the scrutiny; and their secret arrangements being not yet satisfactorily concluded, they continued to throw away their votes upon the names which held the lowest consideration, and were the last in the chance of success. And thus it happened, that, at the conclusion of one of these scrutinies, to the astonishment and dismay of the whole college, one Gabriel Condolmieri, the least and most insignificant member of the sacred body, was found in possession of two-thirds of the suffrages*. There was no space to repent or retract; the election was already valid, and the bark of St. Peter was *thus* consigned, in the most anxious moment of its destiny, to the hand of Eugenius IV.

*Election and Character
of Eugenius IV.;*

Had that Pontiff been as deeply impressed with his own incapacity as the rest of the Christian world, he might occasionally have followed the counsel of wiser men; but, on the contrary, he was the most presumptuous, as he was the most ignorant, of mankind†. The rigorous habits of a monastic life had equally contracted his principles, and blinded his judgment; so that he perpetually mistook precipitation for decision, and then thought to redeem his rashness by his obstinacy. Without talents or any steady policy, through the very restlessness of his character, he exercised

* It is thus that Sismondi describes the elevation of Eugenius, without any question as to the credibility of his authorities. But we are bound to add, that several Ecclesiastical Historians, of various ages, whom we have consulted on this subject, are silent as to the circumstance mentioned in the text. Sismondi (chap. 66.) cites Andrea Billii *Histor. Mediolan.* l. ix. p. 143.

† He was remarkable for a downcast look. 'Vultu alioqui decoro et venerabili, nunquam oculos in publico attollebat, ut a parente meo, qui eum sequebatur, accepi.'—Volterra, lib. xxii., p. 815, ap. Bayle.

an influence which was everywhere felt, and everywhere felt for evil*. And if it were just to select from the long list of pontifical delinquents one name, to which the downfall of the Church should more particularly be ascribed, we should not greatly err in attaching that stigma to Eugenius.

The unexpected accident of his elevation inflated still further an inconstant mind. Some success which he gained in a struggle with the Colonna family for the treasures of his predecessors, filled him with unbounded confidence; and it was in such a mood that he plunged into hostilities with the Council of Basle. His first endeavours were directed to crush it, ere it came into operation or even existence; but finding that hopeless, and convinced that an assembly so solemnly convoked, and so earnestly desired, must meet or seem to meet, he determined to neutralize its character by changing its place. Accordingly, he notified to the President, towards the end of the year, that 'by his own full power' he had *transferred*

it to Bologna, in Italy. The President was the Cardinal Julian Cesarini, a man whose eminent talents qualified him for that office, in which he was placed by Martin, and confirmed by Eugenius, and who may have deserved the reputation which he has received from Bossuet, of being 'the greatest character of his age.' At any rate, he was, on this occasion, more mindful of his duties to the Church, than of his obligations to his master, and respectfully refused obedience to the pontifical mandate.

Julian Cesarini, Cardinal of St. Angelo.

Three purposes were specified, for which the Council of Basle was convoked†: (1.) The reunion of the Latin and Greek churches; (2.) The reform of the Church in its head and members; (3.) The reconciliation of the Hussites. We shall confine our account, for the present, to the second of these, and resume the thread which was broken at Constance: in so doing, it will be our misfortune again to observe the one party furiously contending against its own lasting interests, and repelling the friendly hand which would have purified and saved a foul and falling system; and the other party, thwarted by perpetual impediments, insults, artifices, so as to confine its exertions to unworthy objects, and not effectually to accomplish even those. The former, consisting for the most part of Italians, were the myrmidons of absolute papacy; while the latter comprehended almost all that was enlightened and generous and virtuous among the clergy of the rest of Europe.

Though many of the prelates had been long assembled, the first public session‡ was not held until the 14th of December, 1431; and from that time forwards, for the space of two entire years, the energies and patience of the

* Contemporary Italian historians exert all the talents of partizanship in his favour. But Sismondi, who has estimated with less prejudice his political, as well as his ecclesiastical character, speaks of him very differently. 'Dans les révolutions violentes où on le voit sans cesse engagé, en guerre avec son clergé, avec ses sujets, avec ses bienfaiteurs, il manque presque toujours en même temps et de la bonne foi, et de la politique. Il y a peu de tyrans à qui on peut reprocher plus d'actes de perfidie et de cruauté; il y a peu de monarques imbécilles, qui aient donné plus de preuves d'incapacité et d'inconséquence.' *Republ. Ital.*, cap. lxx.

† 'Concilium hoc congregatum est propter extirpandas hæreses, faciendum pacem, reformandum mores.' *Epist.* (2) Juliani Card. ad Eugen. IV. Julian places first that which seems to have been in his mind the most important object: the third, the reformation, he regarded rather as the means of restoring the unity of the Church.

‡ The method in which that very large body proceeded through its deliberations was both generally judicious, and particularly calculated to neutralize the majority of Italian deputies. It is given at length by the *Contin. of Fleury*, liv. cvi., § 6.

fathers were wearied, and their passions excited, and their attention wholly diverted from the great object of their meeting, by uninterrupted contentions with Eugenius. They had come together from all parts of Europe, and their numbers were swelled by the addition of many of the inferior clergy; they arrived, deploring the debasement, and eager for the regeneration, of their Church; they were confident, too, in their power, and it was to this power that they chiefly trusted to repress the excesses of papacy; yet, when they would have advanced with ardour to realize these hopes, they found themselves engaged in a tedious and irritating contest for their own independence. In the course of this contest they published and republished those decrees of Constance, which proclaimed the superior prerogatives of the Council. They reiterated the authorized assertions, that a Council General represents the Church, and is the Church; that, as such, it derives its attributes *immediately* from Jesus Christ; that, as such, it is impeccable; that it is thus possessed of infallibility—a boon which had been denied, not only to Popes who had erred in matters of faith, but to the angels* themselves, for they had sinned; that on these accounts the Pope was subject to the Council in all things regarding (1) faith, (2) the extirpation of schism, and (3) the reformation of the Church; that he was only the *ministerial*† head of the Church, inferior in eminence to that mystical body‡; and consequently (for this was the point to which the whole tended), that he possessed no power over the Council, either to dissolve or transfer it. But all these, and all similar assertions, fell without any effect upon the mind of a pontiff, who was in real monastic sincerity persuaded, that there existed in the Church no other legitimate authority whatsoever, excepting his own. It was in vain to appeal to ancient canons against modern usurpations, where ignorance had conspired with interest to overthrow reason and justice. It was in vain, that all the learning and genius and eloquence of the Church were arrayed on the same side—their weapons were unfelt or unheeded by a stupid and selfish bigotry.

During this controversy (if such it may be called) Cardinal Julian boldly maintained the principles of the Council and the cause of the Catholic Church. His mind was naturally capacious: deep and assiduous study, which so commonly contracts a feeble understanding, had enlarged and enlightened his; and a mission, which he had personally undertaken for the conciliation of the Bohemians, had brought before his eyes the causes, the obstinacy and the contagiousness of spiritual rebellion. He was one of the few Italians, who had penetrated the truth, so long manifest

*Cardinal Julian
Cesarini.*

* The 'synodal response of the Council may be found in substance in the *Continuator of Fleury*, lib. cvi., § 14. The original is in *Labbe's Hist. Concil.*

† This is urged by *Æneas Sylvius*, *Comment. de Gestis Basil. Concil.*, lib. i., p. 16. The same writer also argues that the Pope is more properly the *Vicar of the Church* than the Vicar of Christ.

‡ This last position, together with some of the others, was proved by arguments derived (1) from reason, (2) from experience, (3) from authority, in the synodal response addressed to Eugenius, at the second session. The argument from authority chiefly rested on the text from the 18th chapter of St. Matthew—'If thy brother shall trespass against thee, and will not hear thee, and shall neglect to hear the witnesses, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' . . . Still the question remained, what constituted the Church?

to the northern prelates, that a thorough reformation in *discipline* was necessary for the preservation of the Church. We cannot so well illustrate the condition of affairs at that period, as by citing some passages from the two celebrated epistles which he addressed from Basle to Eugenius*. 'One great motive with me to join this Council was the deformity and dissoluteness of the German clergy, on account of which the laity are immoderately irritated against the ecclesiastical state: so much so, as to make it matter of serious apprehension whether, if they be not reformed, the people will not rush, after the example of the Hussites, upon the whole clergy, as they publicly menace to do. Moreover, this deformity gives great audacity to the Bohemians, and great colouring to the errors of those, who are loudest in their invectives against the baseness of the clergy: on which account, had a general Council not been convoked at this place, it had been necessary to collect a provincial synod for the reform of the German clergy; since, in truth, if that clergy be not corrected, even though the heresy of Bohemia should be extinguished, others would rise up in its place.' . . . 'If you should dissolve this Council, what will the whole world say, when it shall learn the act? Will it not decide, that the clergy is incorrigible, and desirous for ever to grovel in the filth of its own deformity? Many councils have been celebrated in our days, from which no reform has proceeded; the nations are expecting that some fruit should come from this. But if it is dissolved, all will exclaim that we laugh at God and man. As no hope of our correction will any longer be left, the laity will rush, like Hussites, upon us. This design is already publicly rumoured. The minds of men are pregnant; they are already beginning to vomit the poison intended for our destruction. They will suppose that they are offering a sacrifice to God, when they shall murder or despoil the clergy. Sunk in general estimation into the depth of evil, these last will become odious to God and the world; and the very moderate respect which is now felt for them will entirely perish. This Council is still some little restraint upon secular men; but as soon as they shall find their last hope fail them, they will let loose the reins of public persecution.' . . . 'Should the Council be dissolved, the people of Germany, seeing themselves not only deserted but deluded by the Church, will join with the heretics, and hate us even more than they. Alas! how frightful will be the confusion! how certain the termination! . . . Already I behold the axe laid at the root. The tree is bending to its fall, and can resist no longer. And certainly, *though it could stand of itself, we ourselves*

* The first Epistle begins in these words—'Multa me cogunt libere et intrepide loqui ad Sanctitatem vestram; periculum videlicet eversionis fidei ac status ecclesiastici, et subtractionis obedientiæ a Sede Apostolica in iis partibus; denigratio quoque famæ ejusdem Sanctitatis. Cogit et me charitas qua erga V. S. afficior et qua mihi affici scio. Ita enim opus est ut, intellecto discrimine, cautius rebus agendis postea consulatur.' The following sentiment is worthy of the best ages of Christianity: 'Et si dicat S. V. Habui- mus guerram (bellum); ego respondebo, quod etiam si guerræ adhuc durarent, etiam si essetis certi perdere Romam, et totum patrimonium ecclesiæ, potius subveniendum est fidei et animabus, pro quibus Dominus noster Jesus Christus mortuus est, quam arcibus et mœnibus civitatum. *Carior est Christo una anima quam non solum temporale ecclesiæ patrimonium, sed etiam cælum et terra.*' . . . Again, 'Pro Deo, non permittat sibi V. S. talia persuaderi, *quia timeo dissidium in ecclesia Dei.* Vereor ne advenerit tempus, de quo dicit Apostolus, quod oportet primum ut fiat discessio.' The fears of the Cardinal were obviously directed *not* to a second schism, a mere orthodox division of the Church, but to the absolute revolt of its children. But its destiny was not yet accomplished; one more century of turbulent, contested, and flagitious domination was yet required to fill the cup. But if the overflow did not take place at the time, it at least proceeded from the country, indicated by Julian.

should precipitate it to earth.' . . 'Again, should a prorogation be proposed and a transfer of place, to the end that in the presence of your holiness greater blessings may be accomplished, no man living will believe it.' 'We have been deluded (they say) in the Council of Sienna: so it is again in this; legates have been sent out, bulls have been issued; nevertheless, a change in the place is now sought, and a delay in the time. What better hope will there be then?' Most blessed Father, believe me, the scandals which I have mentioned will not be removed by this delay. Let us ask the heretics, whether they will delay for a year and a half the dissemination of their virulence? Let us ask those, who are scandalized at the deformity of the clergy, if they will for so long *delay* their indignation? Not a day passes in which that heresy does not sprout forth; not a day in which they do not seduce or oppress some Catholics; they do not lose the smallest moment of time. There is not a day, in which new scandals do not arise from the depravity of the clergy; yet all measures for their remedy are procrastinated! Let us do what can be done now. Let the rest be reserved for this *year and a half*. For I have great fears that, before the end of the year and a half, unless means be taken to prevent it, the greater part of the clergy of Germany will be in desolation. It is certain, that, if the word should be once spread through Germany that the council is dissolved, the whole body of the clergy would be consigned to plunder.' 'But I hear that some are apprehensive lest the temporalities should be taken away from the Church by this council. A strange notion! Though, if this council did not consist of ecclesiastics, there might be some question on the subject. But where shall we find the ecclesiastic, who would consent to such a project? not only from its injustice, but from the loss the body would sustain from it. And where the layman? there are none, or next to none? And if some princes should haply send their ambassadors, they will send, for the most part, ecclesiastics, who would in no wise consent. Even the few laymen, who will be present, will not be admitted to vote on matters strictly ecclesiastical; and I scarcely think that there will be, upon the whole, ten secular lords present, and perhaps not half so many. But if we dismiss the council, the laity will then come and take our temporalities indeed. When God wishes to inflict any misfortune upon any people, he first so disposes, that their dangers shall not be perceived nor understood. And such is now the condition of ecclesiastics; they are not blind, but worse than blind; they see the flame before them, and rush headlong into it.' 'Within these few last days I have received intelligence, which should tend still further to divert you from dissolving the council. The prelates of France have assembled at Bourges, and, after long and scrupulous investigation, have decided that this council is not only legitimate, but must also of necessity be celebrated both in this place and at this time; and so the French clergy is about to join it. The reasons which have moved them to this were sent at the same time, and have been forwarded to your holiness. Why then do you longer delay? You have striven with all your power, by messages, letters, and various other expedients, to keep the clergy away; you have struggled with your whole force utterly to destroy this council. Nevertheless, as you see, it swells and increases day by day, and the more severe the prohibition, the more ardent is the opposite impulse. Tell me now—is not this to resist the will of God? Why do you provoke the Church to indignation? Why do you irritate the Christian people? Condescend, I implore you, so to act, as to secure for yourself the love and good will, and not the hatred, of mankind.'

The eloquent expressions of reason and truth were wasted upon the sordid soul of Eugenius. He persisted in measures of opposition; they were met by a process of citation on the part of the council; and this was retorted by a Bull of dissolution; both were equally ineffectual. At length, on the 12th of July, 1438, the fathers proceeded one step farther; they suspended the pontiff from his dignity, and prohibited all Christians from paying him obedience. Eugenius, in the plenitude of his own power, annulled their decree; and this noisy but innocuous altercation might have continued for some time longer, without any advantage or any honour to either party, had not some accidental circumstances interrupted it. The political enterprises of the Pope had not been more happily conducted, than his ecclesiastical measures. During the winter of 1438 he was threatened by a complication of disasters. The Colonna attacked him at home; the Duke of Milan assailed him from abroad; his subjects were universally discontented, and their menaces resounded in his capital; while Sigismond had declared loudly in favour of the council, and had even countenanced it by his presence. Under these circumstances, Eugenius suddenly lowered his pretensions, and withdrew his opposition. The offensive Bulls were revoked; and under the plea of co-operating with the council, and with the design of embarrassing it, he sent two legates to Basle to represent his authority.

This hollow reconciliation took place early in 1434; and as the difficulties of the Pope increased during the following spring, so far as to oblige him to fly from his capital and take refuge at Florence, the fathers were at length enabled to turn with some reviving hopes to the subject of reformation.

Nineteen* sessions, during four invaluable years, had already been consumed without any benefit either to the Pope, the council, or the Church.

In the twentieth, which did not meet until January 23, 1435, some edicts were at length published for the repression of ecclesiastical abuses; and during the fourteen months which followed, other canons were enacted to the same end. Their substance may be expressed in very few lines. (1.) Severe penalties were proclaimed against concubinary clergy, including all who, having suspicious women in their service, had disregarded the command of the Superior to dismiss them. (2.) It was prohibited (in the name of the Holy Spirit) to pay any fees in the court of Rome, or elsewhere, for confirmation of elections, for admissions, postulations, or presentations; for provision, collation, disposition, &c. &c. by laymen; for institution, installation, or investiture, in cathedral or metropolitan churches or monasteries, in dignities, benefices, or other ecclesiastical offices; for holy orders, for benedictions, or concessions of the pallium; for Bulls, for the seal, for common annates, *servitia minuta*, first-fruits, deports†; or on any other colour or pretext. The exaction, payment or

* We should, perhaps, mention that, in the nineteenth session, the council renewed the antient decrees about the conversion and *excommunication* of Jews, and the necessary distinction in their dress and residence; and also on the establishment of oriental professorships in the various Universities—the last, in confirmation of a lifeless canon of the council of Vienne. Previously, too—in the twelfth session—a general decree had been promulgated, with a view to restore episcopal *elections* to their original form, and to deprive the Pope of reservations; but it was so general, that little practical effect could be expected from it.

† (1.) The *deport* was the year's income of vacant cures paid to the Pope or bishop. It was a tax instituted by the Popes of Avignon, under the pretext of holy wars. (2.) The

promise, of such fees were forbidden under the penalties of simony. 'And even (it was enacted), even, which may God prohibit, if the Roman pontiff himself, who is bound more than any other to observe the holy canons, should throw scandal on the Church by violating, in any way, this decree, he shall be brought to trial before a general council.' This passed in the twenty-first session (June 9, 1435); and it is curious to observe the desperate exertions, with which the Pope and his legates and inferior myrmidons put every resource of craft and intrigue into action, in order to prevent, to annul, or to neutralize this measure. But they were defeated by the firmness of the majority of the council in a good cause: and if many more such triumphs had been obtained by the same party; if many more such restrictions on the worst excesses of Rome had been imposed and enforced, her supremacy over the Catholic Church had not so speedily passed away from her.

(3.) The twenty-third session (March 25, 1436) regulated the election of the Pope, and confirmed the decree of the thirty-ninth session of Constance, which had prescribed a formula of faith, to be approved on oath, on the day of election. The oath was to be renewed every year on the anniversary of the election. It proceeded to moderate the nepotism of the pontiffs, —so far, at least, as to confine their *secular* favours,—the dukedoms, marquises, captaincies, governorships, and other offices which were at their disposal as temporal monarchs—to the second degree of relationship. New laws were also published for the better constitution of the Sacred College, which differed in very trifling, if in any, respects, from the enactments of Constance on the same subject. The legislation of Basle also descended to some less important subjects: it consulted the delicacy of 'timorous consciences' by specifying the degree of obedience due to *general* sentences of excommunication; it restrained the punishment of interdicts to the offences of the city or its government: any sins of an individual citizen were held insufficient to provoke that indiscriminate chastisement. It prohibited appeals, while the causes were yet pending; it condemned the spectacles, which took place in the churches on particular festivals; it promulgated decrees for the greater solemnity of the divine offices, and for the more decorous dress and deportment of the officiating ministers.

Such is the substance of the enactments of the council of Basle for the reform of the Church. It is true that, at a much later period of its continuance, it published, in the thirty-first session (January 24, 1438,) two de-

grace expectative was the Pope's assurance of presentation to a particular benefice, when it should become vacant. This right originated in simple recommendation; afterwards it changed into command. To the first letters, called *monitory*, letters *preceptory* were added; and when it was necessary, letters *executory* were also addressed to some papal commissioners, whose duty it became to compel the ordinary to present, on pain of excommunication. This procedure gradually gained ground from the twelfth age. (3.) The *reservation* was a declaration, by which the Pope pretended to appoint to a benefice, when it should become vacant, with prohibition to the chapter to elect, or the ordinary to collate. From special, the Popes proceeded to *general* reservations; from general to universal; at least John XXII. reserved, by a single edict, all the cathedrals in Christendom. This usurpation was attacked with success both at Pisa, Constance, and Basle; and the rights, which the French Church acquired in that matter at Basle, passed into the Pragmatic Sanction, and thence, with some modification, into the Concordat. The council of Trent abolished reservations entirely. The practice is traced as high as Innocent III. . . . Both the second and third of these were contrary to the canons of the third Lateran council, held by Alexander III. in 1179, which published a general prohibition against all dispositions of benefices previous to vacancy.—Fleury, Institut. au Droit Eccles., p. ii.; ch. xv.

crees ; the one for the limitation of *appeals* to Rome, the other to revoke and prohibit expectative graces, and subject the *provisions* of the Pope to certain specified restrictions ; but these, even had they been very fundamental improvements, were passed at a period when the legitimacy of the council itself was much disputed ; and probably they never acquired general authority. Those which we have above enumerated may be considered as comprising all that the assembled fathers really accomplished, during deliberations which continued, at least nominally, through the space of nearly twelve years.

The two legates, to whom the pontifical interests had been entrusted by Eugenius, followed with abundant zeal and capacity their private instructions. No device, which seemed calculated to

Conduct of the Pope's Legates. thwart the progress of reform, had been neglected by them. Every objection had been magnified into a difficulty, every difficulty had been swelled into an insurmountable impediment. The meanest sophistry had been confronted with the boldest reason ; artifice, fraud, seduction had been arrayed against upright purposes and generous principles* ; delays had been created, falsehoods propagated, subterfuges invented, and all that minute machinery set in motion, which is at all times employed in the defence of corrupt systems, by those who find their profit in the corruption†. To the honour of the reformers of Basle be it recorded, that the intrigues which were eternally in operation to divide or to degrade them, were inefficient ; the firmness of those respectable ecclesiastics‡, their intelligence and their honesty reflected upon the Catholic Church a splendid gleam of glory in the moment of her danger and tribulation ; and their perseverance might still have wrought some great advantage, had not a new circumstance arisen to foil it.

The conciliation of the Greek Church was one of the avowed objects of the council ; and as deputies were expected from the east to confer on

Final breach between the Pope and the Council. that subject, their convenience and inclinations as to the *place* of conference required some attention ; both (it was justly said) would be best consulted by substituting for Basle some city in Italy. It was in vain that the council then

* 'Scitis vosmetipsi quoties hæ vobis *dilationes* nocuerint, quotiesque paucorum moræ dierum longissimum traxit spatium ; qui jam octavum annum in *dilationibus* agitis, sæpè *dilationes* ex *dilationibus* vidistis emergere.'—*Cardinalis Arelatensis*, ap. *Æn. Sylv. Gest. Basil. Concil.*

† 'Quis est qui existimet Romanum pontificem ad sui emendationem concilium conjurare ? Nempe ut peccant homines, sic etiam impunè peccar evolvunt.' *Æneas Sylv. de Gest. Basil. Conc., l. i., p. 20.*

‡ The expressions of *Æneas Sylvius* almost rise into eloquence. 'Ubinam gentium talis patrum est chorus, ubi tantum scientiæ lumen, ubi prudentia, ubi bonitas est, quæ nomen patrum æquare virtutibus queat ? Oh integerrimam fraternitatem ! oh verum orbis terrarum Senatum ! Quam pulchra, quam suavis, quam devota res fuit, hic celebrantes episcopos, illic orantes abbates, alibi vero doctores divinas legentes historias audire ! . . . et unum ad lumen candelæ scribentem cernere, alium vero grande aliquid meditantem intueri. . . . Illic cum exeuntem cella aut Christianum aut alium quempiam ex antiquioribus vidisses, non alium certe videre putasses, quam vel magnum Antonium, vel Paulum simplicem ; et illum sane Hilarionem, illum Paphnutium, illum Amonem æquiparasses. Plus autem hoc in loco quam in Antoniana solitudine reperisses, siquidem Hieronymo etiam et Augustino obviasses, quorum litteræ in conclavi fuerunt, in eremo non fuerunt. . . Custodiebatur inter dominos magna charitas, inter famulos bona dilectio, inter utrosque optimum silentium, &c. &c.' *De Gestis Basil. Concil., lib. ii., pag. 57.* It should be mentioned that this description is not general, but relates only to the fathers who constituted the conclave for the election of the new Pope—the élite of the council.

proposed Avignon, or Savoy; the Pope would listen to no such compromise, but pressed the superior advantages of an Italian city. . . At the same time, both parties had opened negotiations at Constantinople; and the contests, which had been enacted at Basle, were repeated, with a different result, before the patriarch and the emperor. In that refined court, the superior tactics of the papal party prevailed; and in the intestine commotions of the hierarchy of the west, the oriental autocrat listened more partially to the monarch, than to the senate, of the Church. Besides, while his emissaries were thus advancing his views abroad, the Pope's domestic embarrassments had gradually diminished, and with them his fears and his prudence. Thus elated, he determined again to engage with the council in open warfare. Accordingly we observe, that, about the twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions, his legates assumed a higher tone than formerly: on the other hand, the council breathed nothing but indignation and defiance; and thus, after a short and feverish suspension, the former quarrels were renewed, and not even the semblance of concord was ever afterwards restored.

The second contest began nearly where the first had ended. The Pope manœuvred to transfer the council to Italy. The council cited the Pope to Basle (July 31, 1437), to answer for his vexatious opposition to the reform of the Church. And the Pope, in that plenitude of power to which he had never formally abandoned his pretensions, declared the council transferred to Ferrara. In the 28th session (Oct. 1, 1437), Eugenius was convicted of contumacy; and on the 10th of the January following, he celebrated, in defiance of the sentence, the first session of the council of Ferrara. On that occasion he solemnly annulled every future act of the assembly at Basle, excepting only such, as should have reference to the troubles of Bohemia.

On the eve of the opening of the Council of Ferrara, Cardinal Julian, whose fidelity to the body over which he presided, and earnestness in the discharge of that office, had never been questioned, suddenly departed from Basle, and passed over to the party of the Pope. The defection of so considerable a person, at so dangerous a crisis, might naturally have shaken the firmness of the fathers; and we can also readily believe, that, after Cesarini had taken his resolution, he exerted his great talents to induce as many as he could influence, to follow him. It remains, however, as a memorable fact, that, among the numerous prelates assembled at Basle, four only were persuaded to imitate the example of their president; nor does it appear that, even after the arrival of the Greeks in Italy, any one bishop, or doctor, or dignified ecclesiastic, deserted the cause in which he had first engaged. The sovereigns of Europe remained equally firm, and the king of France even prohibited his subjects from joining the assembly at Ferrara.

*Desertion of Cardinal
Julian.*

It is almost needless to say, that the legitimacy of the Council of Basle has been a subject of dispute among Roman Catholic writers, and that they have differed, according to the diversity of their opinions on the extent and nature of papal supremacy. It has been commonly designated the *Accephalous* Council; and some have maintained that its authority expired as early as the tenth Session; but even Bellarmine allows, that its decrees were binding on the Church, until it commenced its deliberations respecting the *deposition* of the Pope. This last is the more general opinion even among the Transalpine divines—of

*Questions on the legiti-
macy of the Council.*

whom none have been found so rash and inconsistent, as to dispute its canonical convocation and origin. If it be admitted, then, thus generally, that, during those few Sessions, which it devoted to the reform of the Church, it was a true and infallible Council, the controversy, respecting the sessions which followed, can have little importance in the eyes of the historian; since they were consumed in an obstinate contest with a perverse pontiff, without producing any lasting alteration either in the principles or administration of the government of the Church.

We shall not pursue that contest into any detail. The Cardinal Archbishop of Arles, who was born in France near the borders of Savoy, was elected, no unworthy successor to the Chair of
Deposition of Eugenius: Cesarini*. Eugenius was presently 'superseded from all jurisdiction;' but it was not until the middle of April, 1439, that the Council published its celebrated 'Eight Propositions' against that pontiff, as a measure preparatory to his deposition. On this occasion great dissensions arose; the prelates of Spain combined almost unanimously with the Italian party; and the opposition was powerfully conducted by the Archbishop of Palermo (Panormus or Panormitanus†), who had recently made the sacrifice of his private principles to the will of his sovereign. His talents and his eloquence were admired by all; his sophistry influenced the weak or the wavering; and when the Fathers next assembled for the resumption of the debate, the benches of the prelates were almost deserted;—of the multitudes collected at Basle, scarcely twenty mitred heads could be numbered in that congregation‡. The Cardinal of

* 'Vir omnium constantissimus et ad gubernationem Generalium Conciliorum natus.' Æn. Sylv. Comment. de Gestis Basil. Concil., lib. i. p. 25. This particular commendation is explained by subsequent expressions. We shall select two of a very different character. (1) The Cardinal, on an important occasion, fearing to be left in a minority, out-manœuvred the opposition, and prorogued the Council. His friends were delighted—'Alii quidem eum, alii vestimentorum fimbrias, deosculabantur, secutique ipsum plurimi, prudentiam ejus magnopere commendabant, qui, licet origine esset Gallicus, Italos tamen hac die summa homines astutia, superasset.' Ibid. p. 37. (2) A violent pestilence broke out at Basle, and swept away some distinguished members of the Council. Every one supplicated the Cardinal to retire into the country; all his domestics, all his friends, joined with one voice in the same entreaty—"Quid agis, spectate Pater! fuge hunc saltem lunæ defectum, salva tuum caput, quo salvo salvamur omnes; quo etiam pereunte omnes perimus. Quod si te pestis opprimat, ad quem confugiemus? quis nos reget? quis ductor hujus fidelis exercitus erit? Jam tuam Cameram irrepit virus, jam Secretarius tuus, jamque Cubicularius tuus mortem obiit. Considera discrimen, salva teipsum et nos . . ." Sed neque illum preces neque domesticorum funera flectere potuerunt, volentem potius cum vitæ periculo salvare concilium, quam cum periculo concilii salvare vitam. *Sciebat enim, quoniam, se recedente, pauci remanissent, facileque committi fraus in ejus absentia potuisset.* Ibid. lib. ii. p. 48. The man, who united more than Italian subtlety with the courage and self-devotion here discovered, was undoubtedly born to rule his fellow creatures.

† His speech is reported in the Commentaries of the then admirable advocate for the independence of the Church, Æneas Sylvius. His work is chiefly employed on those Acts of the Council, which more immediately preceded the election of Felix V. Panormitanus urged, among other things, that the Pope's error in dissolving the Council was not a heresy; since, though the superiority of the General Council was a truth, it was not an article of faith—so that the Council had not sufficient ground for deposing Eugenius. This seemed unpardonable sophistry to Æneas Sylvius—to Pope Pius II. it probably appeared a very feeble defence of papal rights.

‡ The Council of Basle was composed, besides numerous prelates and abbots, of a great multitude of inferior clergy, who appear to have formed the majority; and we observe, from the narrative of Æneas Sylvius, that, during the violent debates which preceded the deposition of Eugenius, the prelates were for the most part on the side of Panormitanus, that is of the Pope, and the inferior orders on the other. In the session (the

Arles was prepared for this defection; and he had devised a remedy, suited no less to the character of the declining days of Papacy, than of its most prosperous. He commanded the relics of all the Saints in the city to be brought from their sanctuaries, to be carried by the priests to the place of assembly, and deposited by their hands in the vacant seats of the bishops. At this spectacle, (says Æneas Sylvius,) and on the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the multitudes present were moved by an extraordinary impulse of devotion, which overflowed in tears. And throughout the whole Church there was a soft and affectionate bewailing of pious men, who implored in sorrow the divine assistance, and deeply supplicated the Omnipotent God to give aid to the Church, whose children they were. The Session (the thirty-third) was then peacefully dissolved; but in that which followed (June 25th, 1439) the contested measure was carried; and, after eight years of open, or disguised hostility, Eugenius IV. was at length deposed.

On the 5th of November following, Amadeus, duke of Savoy, was elected to the See thus vacated, and assumed the name of Felix V. But as Eugenius retained, without any defection, the obedience of Italy and some other countries, the success of the anti-papal party had no other effect, than to create a second schism. Among the sovereigns of Europe, the most powerful, though ill affected to Eugenius, were far from approving the violent proceedings of the Council; and the German, as well as the French Court, became more distant and guarded in its intercourse with the fathers of Basle; while the inferior princes appear to have recognized or rejected the one Pope or the other, as suited the seeming policy of the moment. And this confusion continued with little interruption until May, 1443, when the Council celebrated its forty-fifth and last Session. It then dissolved itself—or rather transferred its (nominal) sittings to Lyons or Lausanne; while the rival assembly, which was still lingering at Florence, withdrew, by a simultaneous secession, to Rome.

Felix V. maintained his scanty Court, and the faint show of pontifical majesty, at Lausanne; and though the sovereigns both of France and Germany made some exertions to remove the schism, it continued until the death of Eugenius in 1447. Nicholas V. succeeded; and the more general recognition, which he received from the Courts of Europe, as well as his more popular reputation, induced Felix, whose ambition was destitute of selfishness, as his character was moderate and virtuous, to negotiate respecting the cession of his dignity. Certain conditions were accordingly proposed and accepted, and in the year 1449, the creature of the Council of Basle for ever resigned his claims on the Chair of St. Peter. The happy escape from this second peril, which

*Election of Felix V.
and Dissolution of
the Council.*

*Nicholas V. Cession
of Felix.*

thirty-third) described in the text, 'Nullus Arragonensium prælatorum interfuit, nullusque omnino ex tota Hispania. Ex Italia soli Grossitanus Episcopus et Abbas de Dona. Doctores autem et cæteri inferiores magno in numero Arragonenses fuerunt, et omnes fere, qui aderant, ex Italia Hispanique (nec enim inferiores, sicut Prælati, principem timuerunt). Maximaque tunc Arragonensium et Cathelanorum virtus in inferioribus emicuit, qui sese nihilum necessitati ecclesiæ denegarunt.' 'Si enim episcopi haud multi erant, plena tamen omnia fuerunt subsellia procuratoribus episcoporum, archidiaconis, præpositis, prioribus, presbyteris et divini et humani juris doctoribus, quos aut quadringentos aut certe plures esse iudicavi, &c.' This republican constitution of the Council must, indeed, have rendered it peculiarly obnoxious to the prejudices of a monastic Pope.—Comment. Æn. Sylvii, l. ii. p. 43.

menaced the unity of the Church, filled the people with universal joy; the errors of the Hussites and the scandals of the clergy were for the moment forgotten; and everywhere, after the fashion of the times, a commemorative verse was chanted,—

Fulsit lux mundo; cessit Felix Nicolaus.

Though the general measures of reformation, published by the Council of Basle, were very inadequate to the necessities of the Church, even in the eyes of an orthodox reformer, yet by concurrence with some national assemblies held in Germany, and especially in France, they became instrumental in improving the ecclesiastical government and discipline in both those countries. In Germany, a project, which had been prepared at Nuremburg, in 1438, having failed to obtain the approbation either of the Council or the Pope, a Diet was opened at Mayence in the March of the year following. The deputies from Basle, and some emissaries of Eugenius were present; and the Assembly, after some deliberation, received all the general decrees of the Council*. We do not learn, however, that any means were taken to give them efficacy, or to establish them as the permanent and living code of the German Church. At any rate, its independence was soon afterwards betrayed by Frederic III.; and in the negotiations between the empire and the Holy See, which were conducted by his secretary, Æneas Sylvius, that accomplished politician was less faithful to the interests which he thus represented, than to those over which he was destined hereafter to preside. The concordats, arranged at Aschaffenburg in 1448, resigned most of the advantages which the Germans had derived from the proceedings at Basle, and left the papal rights nearly in the situation in which they had been placed by Martin V.†

The French were at the same time conducting their national exertions with greater method and decision, and with a much better prospect of permanent effect. The first meeting of their prelates *Council of Bourges.* at Bourges was contemporary with that of the Council of Basle. Some useful resolutions were then passed. But the Grand Assembly, which fixed the liberties of the Gallican Church, was held in the same city in the year 1438. It was convoked by Charles VII., who presided in person; it was thronged by his most illustrious subjects, secular as well as ecclesiastic; and it was attended by the authorized legates both of Eugenius and the Council. The result of their deliberations was the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction‡, the great bulwark of the national Church, against the usurpations of Rome—that to which the French divines afterwards clung with so much resolution and tenacity, even after it had been betrayed to the enemy by an interested monarch.

* The Diet of Mayence withheld its sanction from those decrees, which were directly levelled against Eugenius.

† The Annates, the great bone of contention, were retained in substance by the Pope. Instead of the arbitrary reservation of benefices, he obtained the positive right of collation during six alternate months of every year. Episcopal elections were restored to the chapters—the Pope only nominating in case of translation, or of a person, canonically disqualified, being presented for confirmation.—See Hallam, Middle Ages, chap. vii.

‡ Pragmatic sanction was a general term for all important ordinances of Church or State—those, perhaps, more properly, which were enacted in public assemblies, with the counsel of eminent juriconsults, or *Pragmatici*.

The Gallican Liberties, while they embraced a number of particular provisions, were founded on two grand principles:—(1) That the Pope has no authority in the kingdom of France over any thing concerning temporals. (2) That, though the Pope is acknowledged as sovereign lord in spirituals, his power even in these is restricted and controlled by the canons and regulations of the antient Councils of the Church*, received in this kingdom.

The Articles constituting the Pragmatic Sanction were chiefly founded on the Decrees of the twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-third Sessions of the Council of Basle. Some of these were, indeed, modified, with a view to accommodate them to the peculiar circumstances of the country, not (as was expressly declared) from any disrespect to the authority of that Assembly. But the greater part were at once adopted into the Church of France, and ardently embraced by the clergy and the nation. Yet can it scarcely be necessary to remind the reader, that most of the abuses thus removed concerned no more vital question, than the *patronage* of the Church—that the object of most of those vaunted resolutions was only to relieve the clergy (and, to a certain extent, the people of France) from the *contributions*, which, under a thousand names and pretexts, were exacted by the Apostolical Chancery; that the avarice of the Holy See was the most unpopular among its vices; and that mere pecuniary motives were at the bottom of more than half the grievances, which alienated its children from it†.

*The Pragmatic
Sanction.*

We shall not here relate the exertions which were made by Pius II. to subvert the principles, of which, as Æneas Sylvius, he had been the warmest advocate, and to overthrow the liberties, which his own hand had planted. The nominal repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction by Louis XI. was never ratified by his subjects, nor effected in defiance of their dissent; and the articles which were enacted at Bourges continued for the most part in force until the reign of Francis I. The consequence was, that the French people, being in a great degree sheltered from the extortions of Rome, were less disposed to question her general rights, and to rebel against her spiritual prerogatives. The most sordid and disgusting particulars of her system were not so commonly presented to their view. A smaller contribution, indeed, flowed into her treasuries, and her emissaries were more sparingly scattered in that country; but her

* 'La première est, Que les Papes ne peuvent rien commander ni ordonner, soit en général soit en particulier, de ce qui concerne les choses temporelles es pays et terres de l'obéissance et souveraineté du Roy Tres-Chrestien: et s'ils y commandent ou statuent quelque chose, les sujets du Roy, encores qu'ils fussent clerics, ne sont tenus pour obeyr pour ce regard.

† La seconde, Qu'encores que le Pape soit reconnu pour suzerain es choses spirituelles; toutesfois en France la puissance absolue et infinie n'a point de lieu, mais est retenue et bornée par les canons et règles des anciens conciles de l'Eglise réceus en ce royaume. Et in hoc maxime consistit Libertas Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ.' See Commentaire sur le Traité des Lib. de l'Eglise Gall. de Pierre Pithov. Paris, 1652.

‡ The Pragmatic Sanction consisted of twenty-three articles, several of which regarded the police of cathedral churches, the celebration of the divine offices, and other matters not connected with papal prerogatives. There are also some few which are so connected, which have yet no reference to patronage—they respect the periodical assembly, and the superior authority, of General Councils, and the number of the Sacred College. But elections, reservations, collections, expectative graces, and annates formed after all the burden of the grievances—and to those we may fairly add appeals to the Court of Rome, which were now become only an additional method of raising money.—See Histoire de l'Orig. de la Pragm. Sanct., &c. par Pierre Pithov.

name was less odious, as her vices were less obtrusive. And while in Germany, the re-establishment of the Papal despotism, with all its train of annates, reservations, and indulgences, produced, by an inevitable necessity, the violent revolt and final independence of the oppressed, so the Catholics of France submitted with less reluctance to her mitigated sway.

The most important decrees promulgated at Constance was, perhaps, that which fixed the periodical meeting of general councils; for it was vain to have established the supremacy of those assemblies, unless continual opportunities were afforded them for its exercise. The spirit of Rome was invariable, and in perpetual action; it could not be counteracted and restrained, unless by frequent collision with the restraining body. The wisest resolutions, unless enforced by the constant protection of the power which created them, would be neutralized or crushed in the pontifical grasp. The justice of this apprehension was proved by the fate of the very decree, of which we are now speaking. It was perseveringly eluded by the Popes who followed, and with so much success, that no other general council was convoked before the end of the century. After the separation of the fathers of Basle, the repose and prerogatives of the pontiffs were never seriously disturbed, until the destined season at length arrived, in which they were invaded by a harsher voice and a far ruder hand.

It has been made a question among ecclesiastical writers, whether the decennial meetings of those bodies, as decreed at Constance, would have conferred benefit or the contrary, on the Roman Catholic Church. It is argued on the one hand, that they presented the only check upon the excesses of the Roman court, which were hurrying the Church to its destruction; that in the progressive light and information of the age, an absolute spiritual despotism could not possibly endure much longer, and that the monarchy of the Church could only hope for stability through an infusion of the popular principle; since even the clergy themselves were no longer well affected towards an unlimited government; that many abuses in morals and discipline, which were continually growing up, were most effectually corrected by the authority of Councils.

On the other hand, it is disputed whether the benefits derived from the three assemblies, which had taken place, were, in fact, so very substantial? Whether they were at all proportionate to the weighty machinery, which was moved to produce them? Whether the non-residence of so many prelates and other clergy, during such long periods, was not a new evil of immense importance? Whether those divisions and passionate contests among spiritual ministers, which seemed the necessary fruit of general councils, did not cast as many scandals on the church, as those which were removed? Whether the immediate danger of a positive schism, which had actually been occasioned by the proceedings at Basle, did not at least counterbalance those remote perils, which timely remedies might, or might not, perhaps, have averted?

To a Protestant impartially comparing these considerations, it is, in the first place, obvious, that a cordial co-operation between an enlightened Pope and a body of intelligent ecclesiastics, for the single purpose of correcting abuses in government and discipline, and otherwise modifying the system by seasonable alterations, would have afforded the best human probability of preserving the papal supremacy undisputed, and deferring the hour of a more perfect reformation. But, on the other hand, it is equally manifest, that, as the court of Rome was at that time constituted, so generous a co-operation, so provident a sacrifice of instant profit for

future security, could not possibly have formed the policy of the Vatican. Those, who have long been in possession of usurped prerogatives, have seldom the courage, when the moment of retribution approaches, to concede a part, though they should thereby save the rest; they cling pertinaciously to their meanest acquisitions, until the hand of the reformer is at length provoked to resume the whole. It was thus with the Bishops of Rome: educated in a profligate court, and in the narrowest principles, they commonly obtained their elevation by intrigue or bribery. The pontifical dignity was itself beset by seductions, sufficient to corrupt the most generous mind. So that it was vain to look to Rome for any other policy, than the most contracted and the most selfish.

If these conclusions be true, the periodical meetings of general councils would have only introduced periodical convulsions and schisms. And, although some partial benefits would no doubt have proceeded from their deliberations, they would scarcely have prolonged the duration of a system, of which unity was a necessary characteristic. The *manner* of its destruction might, indeed, have been different; it might have been torn in pieces by intestine discord, instead of sinking before the impulse from without. But its doom was irrevocably sealed; and the seeds of dissolution were too amply sown in the very vitals of the papal Church, to admit of any effectual reformation.

Again; however justly we may applaud the reforming projects of the fathers of Constance and Basle, as indicating some consciousness of shame or of danger, some foresight, at least, if not some virtue, yet it is certain that their general principles were in no respect more moderate than those of the Vatican. We have already observed how the former of those Councils, after investing itself with all the spiritual attributes and authority of the Church, immediately overstepped the boundary*, and drew, like the Popes whom it superseded, the temporal sword. But we have still to describe the most arbitrary and iniquitous act of the same assembly. The Holy Fathers, be it recollected, had met for the reformation of their Church. The word was perpetually on their lips, and they denounced, with unsparing vehemence, some of the corruptions of their own system. In the midst of them were two men of learning, genius, integrity, piety, who had intrusted their personal safety to the faith of the council, John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and these too were reformers. But it happened that *they* had taken a different view of the condition and exigencies of the Church; and while the boldest projects of the wisest among the orthodox were confined to matters of patronage, discipline, ceremony, the hand of the Bohemians had probed a deeper wound: they disputed, if not the doctrinal purity†, at least the spiritual omnipotence of the Church. Those daring innovators had crossed the line which separated reformation from heresy—and they had their recompense. In the clamour which was raised against them, all parties joined as with one voice: divided on all other questions, contending about all other principles, the grand universal assembly was united, from Gerson himself down to the meanest Italian papal minion, in common detestation

*General Principles of
the Councils of Con-
stance and Basle.*

* If the fathers of Constance offended the King of France by the orders which they issued respecting the safe conduct of Sigismund in his journey to Spain; so did those of Basle irritate the princes of Germany by an assumption of temporal authority; and this was their great mistake.

† See the following Chapter.

of the heresy, in implacable rage against its authors. Those venerable martyrs were imprisoned, arraigned, condemned; and then by the command, and in the presence of the majestic *senate* of the Church, the deposer of Popes, the uprooter of corruption, the reformer of Christ's holy Communion—they were deliberately consigned to the flames. Is there any act recorded in the blood-stained annals of the Popes more foul and merciless than that? . . . More than this. The guilt of the murder was enhanced by perfidy; and for the purpose of justifying this last offence (for the former, being founded on the established Church principles, required no apology) they added to those principles another, not less flagitious than any of those already recognized—‘that neither faith nor promise, by natural, divine, or human law, was to be observed to the prejudice of the Catholic religion*.’ Let us here recollect that this maxim did not proceed from the caprice of an arbitrary individual, and a Pope, —for so it would scarcely have claimed our serious notice—but from the considerate resolution of a very numerous assembly, which embodied almost all the learning, wisdom, and moderation of the Roman Catholic Church.

General councils, claiming to act under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, were consequently infallible, as well as impeccable. We shall, therefore, mention one or two of the subjects to which their unerring judgment was directed. In the July of 1434, the council of Basle confirmed a Bull, previously published by Eugenius IV., respecting the veneration due to the sacrament of the Eucharist, and the indulgences granted at the feast of the holy sacrament; with an order for its universal observance in the Church. The thirty-sixth session (Sept. 17, 1439) of the same assembly was occupied in drawing up a decree in favour of the immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin†. This article of faith was solemnly enjoined to all good Catholics; and an universal festival was instituted in its honour, ‘according to the custom of the Roman Church.’ Two years afterwards, at their forty-third meeting, the same fathers confirmed, after a very long deliberation, the feast of the *visitation* of the Holy Virgin. They enacted that it should be celebrated throughout the whole Church by all the faithful; and they accorded to those, who should assist at matins, at the processions, at the sermon, at mass, at the first and at the second vespers, a hundred days of indulgences for each of those offices. At the same time, while they were thus extending the reign of superstition over their obedient children, they were contesting the double communion with the Bohemian rebels, and refusing every concession to reason and to scripture, excepting such‡ as was extorted from them

* ‘Cum tamen dictus Johannes Huss, fidem orthodoxam pertinaciter impugnans, se ab omni conductu et privilegio reddiderit alienum, nec aliqua sibi fides aut promissio de jure naturali, divino vel humano, fuerit in prejudicium Catholicæ fidei observanda: idcirco dicta sancta synodus declarat, &c.’ The words are cited by Hallam (Middle Ages, chap. vii.), without suspicion. We find it asserted, however, by Roman Catholics, that they exist in no MS. except that in the Imperial Library at Vienna; and that even there the formal signatures, attached to the other articles, are not subscribed to this; hence they infer its spuriousness. We should remark that Von der Hardt has published it (tom. iv., p. 521), without any expression of doubt.

† That is, that the holy Virgin was preserved in her conception from the stain of original sin. We observe that bachelors in theology, and others in the University of Paris, were compelled to subscribe, on oath, to their belief in this doctrine. In Spain it is considered an essential part of the Catholic faith at this moment.

‡ The concession of the council respecting the double communion amounted, at last, only to this, that whether the sacrament was administered in one kind or in both, it was still useful to communicants—‘for there could be no doubt that Christ was entire in either

by force. Some individuals must certainly have existed among them, who had penetrated the *inward* depravity of their system and saw the tottering ground on which it stood; but they believed, no doubt, that things would continue to be, as they had been; they were blind to the slow but irresistible progress of inquiry and knowledge.

From the days of St. Bernard to those of Bossuet the extirpation of heresy formed a part or an object* of every scheme of Church reform proposed by churchmen. The principle of toleration was unknown in the ecclesiastical policy; it may have guided the private practice of many enlightened individuals, but it was never inscribed in the code of the Church. Those very councils, from whose generous professions and popular constitution a wiser legislation might have been expected, did but exclude it more fiercely, and banish it more hopelessly. But, in return for their adherence to the favourite vice, of the Church, did they amend any maxim of its government? Did they uproot any unscriptural tenet, any superstitious belief, any profitable imposture, any senseless ceremony, or degrading practice? Did they wash away any spiritual stain from the sanctuary, now that the light from abroad was breaking in upon it? On the contrary, they not only persevered in maintaining every absurdity which had been transmitted to them, but showed a preposterous anxiety to increase the number. It is perfectly true that, in mere matters of discipline, they were fearless innovators, and that they assailed with ardour the more palpable iniquities of the Vatican. But this was the extent of their daring; this was the limit, as they thought, of safe and legitimate reform; all beyond it was inviolable ground. Thus it was, that to question the sanctity of their spiritual corruptions was deemed profane and heretical; and their eyes were wilfully closed against the unalterable truth, that the Church of Christ cannot permanently stand on any other foundation, than the gospel of Christ.

In the meantime, while the fathers of Basle, who saw some part of their danger, were ineffectually contending with an infatuated pontiff, who was blind to the whole, the art of printing was discovered; and the star of universal knowledge, the future arbiter of Churches and of Empires, arose unheeded from the restless bosom of Germany.

CHAPTER XXV.

History of the Hussites.

(I.) General fidelity of England to the Roman See—The beginnings of Wiclif, and the hostility he encountered—To what extent his opposition to Rome was popular—His death at Lutterworth, and the exhumation of his remains in pursuance of a decree of the Council of Constance—His opinions on several important points—He was calumniated by the high churchmen—His translation of the Bible.—(II.) The writings of Wiclif introduced into Bohemia—Origin and qualities of John Huss—His sermons in the Chapel of Bethlehem—Division in the University of Prague—Secession of the Germans, in hostility against Huss—He incurs the displeasure of the Archbishop

element; and that the custom of communicating the laity in one kind, introduced with reason by the Church and holy fathers, long observed and approved by theologians and canonists, should pass for a law, neither to be censured nor altered without the authority of the Church.' This decree was published in 1437, in the thirtieth session.

* For instance, at Constance it formed a *part* of the scheme of the reformers. To 'repress simony, and prosecute Jerome of Prague,' were joint subjects of the same remonstrances. To restore the unity of the Church was to reform the Church. But at Basle the reformation in discipline was chiefly recommended as the *means* of extirpating heresy. (See the passages above cited from Cardinal Julian's two letters.) But it never occurred to either council to consider, whether the heretics might not possibly be right; or, being wrong, whether they might not safely be tolerated.

of Prague—of John XXIII.—is summoned before the Council of Constance—His attachment to the character of Wiclif—Opinions ascribed to the Vauds and Hussites by Æneas Sylvius—many of them disclaimed by Huss—Notion respecting tithes—The restoration of the cup to the laity—demanded not by Huss, but by Jacobellus of Misnia—The principle of persecution advocated by Gerson—Huss proceeds to Constance—The safe conduct of the Emperor—The motives of Huss—Assurances of protection—nevertheless Huss is placed in confinement—and eight articles alleged against him—Condemnation of Wiclif—A public trial granted to Huss—The insults and calumnies to which he is exposed—Three articles to which he adhered—Principles of the Council—Huss refuses to retract—Declaration of Sigismund—Various solicitations and trials to which Huss is subject during his imprisonment—Overture made to him by Sigismund—Interview between Huss and John of Chlum—The sentence passed on Huss—The process of his degradation—and execution—Two principal causes of his destruction.—(III.) Jerome of Prague appears before the Council—His retraction—Subsequent avowal of his opinions—and execution—Observations.—(IV.) Movements occasioned in Bohemia by these executions—The name of Thaborite assumed by the Insurgents—The triumphs of Zisca—Massacre of the Adamites—The Bohemian Deputies proceed to the Council of Basle—The four articles proposed by them—and the consequent ineffectual debate—The scene of negotiation then removed to Prague—Various parties there—Defeat and massacre of the Thaborites—A compact concluded between Sigismund and the Separatists—Real principles of Rome—The Pope refuses to confirm the compact, and the dissensions continue—under Pius II. and Paul II.—Many of the opinions of the Hussites perpetuated by the ‘Bohemian Brothers,’ who became celebrated in the next century.

I. THE Roman See had been long accustomed to consider the English as the most obedient and exemplary among its subjects—an equivocal merit, which it rewarded by more oppressive extortions and more contemptuous insult. It is true, that our kings and statesmen had made at various times some vigorous exertions to mitigate the Papal dominion; but the Popes were enabled to thwart or elude their efforts by the fidelity of the clergy and the people*. Nor was it only the praise of ecclesiastical obsequiousness that our Catholic ancestors deserved of the Holy See; that of immaculate doctrinal purity was ascribed to them with equal justice. They received with reverence every innovation in their belief, every demand on their credulity, which proceeded from the unerring oracles of the Church; but they faithfully discouraged any new opinions originating in any other quarter. The continental heresies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had not been allowed to defile their sanctuary; still less had it been profaned by any weeds of indigenous growth. The land, in which Wiclif was already preparing his immortal weapons for the contest, was that, on which the pontifical regards were fixed with the deepest complacency and most unsuspecting confidence.

John of Wiclif† was born in Yorkshire about the year 1324. He was educated at Oxford; and the great proficiency, which he made in the learning of the schools, did not prevent him from acquiring and deserving the title of the Evangelic, or Gospel, Doctor. His earlier life was distinguished by a bold attack on the corruptions of the clergy, and by great zeal in the contest with the Mendicants, which, in 1360, disturbed the university and the Church. He was raised to the theological chair in 1372; he had previously defended the cause of the Crown against the Pope, respecting the payment of the tribute imposed by Innocent III., and he was known to harbour many anti-papal opinions: but he was not yet committed in direct opposition to Rome. Soon afterwards he formed

* The statutes of *provisors* and *præmunire*, enacted in 1350, anticipated most of the articles of the Pragmatic Sanction of France,—since the first restrained the usurpation of Church patronage by the Pope, and the second protected the temporal rights of the Crown; but neither of them was observed, and the Pope continued to fill the Sees with foreign prelates.

† We do not profess, in the present history, to treat in any detail the ecclesiastical affairs of England; and in the following short account of Wiclif there is little which may not be found much more fully and eloquently expressed in Professor Le Bas' ‘Life of Wiclif.’

part of an embassy to Avignon, instructed to represent and remove the grievances of the Anglican Church. It was not till his return from that mission, when his language was heated by long-treasured indignation, or by the near spectacle of pontifical impurity, that the reformer first incurred the displeasure of the English hierarchy. He was cited before a convocation, held at St. Paul's in 1377; and it seems probable, that he owed his preservation to the powerful protection of John Duke of Lancaster. At the same time the Vatican thundered; and the heresy of Wiclif was compared to that of Marsilius of Padua and others, who had been sheltered against the oppression of John XXII. by the imperial patronage. But the Papal Bull was so little regarded at Oxford*, that it was even made a question, whether it should not be ignominiously rejected; and when the offender was subsequently summoned to Lambeth, he was dismissed with a simple injunction to abstain from diffusing his opinions. Hawbeit, the Pope and his myrmidons continued eager and constant in the pursuit; and there are many who believe, that it was the timely circumstance of the schism, which alone defrauded persecution of its intended victim.

On the other hand, the ardour of Wiclif† was still further inflamed by the appearance of this new deformity—when he saw ‘the head of Antichrist cloven in twain, and the two parts made to fight against each other.’ He even proceeded so far, as to exhort the princes of Europe to seize that signal opportunity of extinguishing the evil entirely. But in their eyes it did not perhaps appear to be an evil at all—at least it was still so deeply rooted in the prejudices of the people, that its extirpation, even had they thought it desirable, had not yet been practicable. It was the misfortune of Wiclif, as it was his greatest glory, that he anticipated, by almost two centuries, the principles of a more enlightened generation; and scattered his holy lessons on a soil, not yet prepared to give them perfect life and maturity.

As long as Wiclif confined, or nearly confined, his vehement reprehensions to the delinquencies of the clergy, or the anti-Christian spirit of the Court of Rome—so long he obtained many and powerful disciples, and could count on their attachment and fidelity. But no sooner did he rise from that manifest and intelligible ground of dissent, and advance into the region of doctrinal disputation, than the enthusiasm and number of his followers declined, and even John of Lancaster strongly enjoined him to desist. In 1381-2 he opened his Sacramentary Controversy; some considerable tumults followed; he was cited in consequence before the Convention at Oxford, and banished from that city. He retired to his rectory at Lutterworth; and after two more years diligently employed in the offices of piety, he died there in peaceful and honourable security—security which was alike honourable to his own character, to the firmness of his illustrious protectors, and to the moderation of the English prelacy. His opinions were never extinguished; and his name continued so formidable to the champions of the Church, that, after an interval of thirty years—after all personal malice and jealousy had long passed away—the Council of Re-

* ‘*Diu in pendulo hærebant, utrum papalem Bullam deberent cum honore suscipere, vel omnino cum dedecore refutare.*’ Walsingham.

† One of the latest labours of his life was another attack on the delinquencies of the clergy, which he described under thirty-three heads in the tract ‘How the office of curates is ordained of God.’ The more profound sense of those delinquencies which he had derived from inveterate habits and principles of piety, gave an ardour to the expressions of his advancing age which surpassed that of his youthful enthusiasm.

formers at Constance published that memorable edict, by which 'the body and bones of Wiclif were to be taken from the ground, and thrown far away from the burial of any Church.' . . . The decree met with a tardy obedience: after the space of thirteen years, the remains were disinterred and burnt, and the ashes cast into the adjoining brook. 'The brook (says Fuller, in words which should be engraven on every heart) did convey his ashes into Avon; Avon into Severn; Severn into the narrow seas; they into the main ocean. And thus the ashes of Wiclif are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the world over.'

His doctrine was formed, with an entire disregard of all spiritual authority, on the foundation of Scripture alone—for 'the

His opinions.

Scripture alone (as he said) is truth.' Various innovations of the Roman Church were opposed by him with various degrees of confidence. Respecting images and the invocation of the saints he wrote at no great length, but with reasonableness and moderation. He rejected transubstantiation, according to the sense of the Church; but he admitted a sort of *real* presence, without affecting to determine the manner. His notion concerning purgatory seems to have gone farther from the belief in which he was educated, as he gradually advanced in knowledge; but he never entirely threw off his original impressions. At last, indeed, he might appear to have considered it as a place of sleep; but his expressions are vague and betray the ignorance, which he was not careful to conceal, either from others or from himself. On other matters he expressed much bolder opinions. He rejected auricular confession; he held pardons and indulgences to be nothing but 'a subtle merchandise of anti-Christian clerks, whereby they magnified their own fictitious power; and instead of causing men to dread sin, encouraged them to wallow therein like hogs.' Excommunication and interdicts were repudiated with equal disdain. He reprobated the compulsory celibacy of the clergy and the imposition of monastic vows; and visited with the austerity of a Puritan, not only the vain and fantastic ceremonies of the Church, but even the devout use of holy psalmody. In the granting of absolution he treated the office of the priest as strictly ministerial and declaratory; and he hastily pronounced confirmation to be a mere ecclesiastical invention, for the purpose of unduly elevating the episcopal dignity. He appears not to have disputed, that the Pope was the highest spiritual authority in the Church; but he rejected with equal scorn his ghostly infallibility and his secular supremacy; and his abhorrence of the court of anti-Christ was so strong, as to be a continual incentive to the bitterest censure. According to the original institution he considered bishops and priests as the same order; and he ascribed (through a defect in historical knowledge) the distinction, which afterwards divided them, to the imperial supremacy. He objected to the possession of any fixed property by the clergy, and maintained that the ecclesiastical endowments were, in their origin, eleemosynary, and that they remained at the disposal of the secular government*.

Such were the opinions which Wiclif promulgated in the theological chair, and in the fourteenth century. His reputation and his dignity raised

* It is observed that, with these opinions, Wiclif held the Divinity Professorship at Oxford, a Prebendal Stall, and the Rectory of Lutterworth. He thought it excusable, no doubt, to conform to the system which he found established, and his enemies at the time thought it no crime in him that he did so; yet he would have stood higher with posterity, had he disdained the plausible excuse, and placed the unequivocal seal of private disinterestedness and generosity upon his public principles.

him far above contempt; but at the same time they embittered the malignity of his enemies. Yet, monstrous as many of his real tenets must have appeared in that age, recourse was had to the usual expedient of charging him with absurd inferences and notions* wholly at variance with any that he professed—as if the churchmen of those days had some secret consciousness of the weakness of their cause, and despaired to make the enemies of their system generally detestable, unless they could also stigmatize them as foes to the acknowledged principles of religion, of morality, and of reason. We are not surprised by such calumnies; neither is it strange that the dissemination of his actual doctrines (for they were diligently disseminated by emissaries† employed by him for that purpose) was followed by some tumults and disorders. The first open struggles of reason against prescription and prejudice—its first appeals to the sense and virtue of mankind against particular interests and established absurdities, are seldom unattended by popular heats and commotions; and the wonder in this case rather is, that the prematurity of the Reformation did not occasion the martyrdom of the reformer.

For many of Wiclif's opinions were too advanced and ripe for the bleak season in which he lived. They were calculated, indeed, for the consideration of all virtuous and disinterested men; and they were sure to *create* in succeeding generations a disposition towards better principles of belief and practice; but they could look for no general reception among those, to whom they were first addressed. Therefore was it wisely determined by that admirable Christian, when he sent them forth into a prejudiced and ignorant world, to promulgate along with them the sacred volume on which they professed to stand. His translation and circulation of the Bible was that among his labours, which secured the efficacy, as it was itself the crown, of all the others. This was the life of the system which he destined to be imperishable—this the treasure which he bequeathed to future ‡ and to better ages, for their immortal inheritance.

II. The queen of Richard II. was a Bohemian princess; and on the death of her husband, she returned, with a train of attendants, to her native land. It is commonly *John of Huss*, believed, that these persons introduced a precious, but a dearly preserved, possession among their countrymen—the works of Wiclif. Others suppose this present to have been made by an Englishman who had travelled to Prague; others by a Bohemian who had studied at Oxford. All may possibly have contributed; but in respect to the more important fact, there seems to be no dispute, that the writings of Wiclif kindled the first sparks of the Bohemian heresies. During the latter days of that venerable teacher, a youth was growing up in an obscure village of Bohemia, who was destined to bear, in his turn, the torch of truth, and to transmit it with a martyr's hand to a long succession of disciples—and he was worthy of the heavenly office. John of Huss, or Hussinetz, was very early distinguished by the force and acuteness of his understanding, the modesty and gravity of his demeanour, the rude and irreproachable austerity of his life. A thoughtful and attenuated countenance, a tall and

* They are to be found in great numbers, chiefly among the articles of impeachment, levelled against his name and memory, and published by Popes and Councils. One error ascribed to him is, 'that he represented God as subject to the devil.'

† Men whom he called his 'poor priests.' See chap. x. of *Le Bas' Life of Wiclif*.

‡ The effect was felt even in the next generation, and the high churchmen began to tremble. By a decree published by the Convocation at St. Paul's in 1408, it was prohibited either to compose or consult any private translation of the Scriptures, on the penalties attached to heresy.

somewhat emaciated form, an uncommon mildness and affability of manner added to the authority of his virtues and the persuasiveness of his eloquence. The University of Prague, at that time extremely flourishing, presented a field for the expansion of his great qualities; in the year 1401 he was appointed president, or dean, of the philosophical faculty, and was elevated, eight years afterwards, to the rectorship of the University.

The Church divided with the academy his talents and his reputation. In the year 1400 he was made confessor to Sophia of Bavaria, the Queen of Bohemia; and in 1405 he had obtained general celebrity by many eloquent sermons delivered *in the vulgar tongue* in his chapel* at Prague. In those fervent addresses to the people, who composed his audience, he frequently inveighed against the corruption of the court of Rome, her indulgences, her crusades, her extortions, and all the multitude of her iniquities; and his harangues were received with impassioned acclamation. Nevertheless, his name was not yet tainted by any charge of heresy; and as late as the July of 1408, Subinco, (or Suinco,) Archbishop of Prague, declared in a public synod, that the kingdom, over which his spiritual guardianship extended, was free from the stain of any religious error. But about this time the University of Prague was disturbed by a violent dissension. The German students, who formed the majority, and to whom a greater share in the government, the dignities, and emoluments of the institution had been allotted by the original statutes†, were vigorously assailed by the native Bohemians; who claimed, as a national right, that, according to the example of Paris, those enviable prerogatives should be transferred to themselves. Huss engaged with zeal in the cause of his countrymen. The king decided in favour of his own subjects, and he was considered to have been chiefly influenced to that resolution by Huss. Many German doctors resigned their offices and retired from the kingdom; and they carried with them, whithersoever they went, deep rancour against the author of their defeat and secession.

Again, about the same time, probably in the beginning of 1409, Huss was extremely zealous in bringing over his country from the cause of Gregory XII., in whose obedience it persisted, to that of the cardinals assembled at Pisa; and this laudable forwardness appears to have been the first offence, which awakened the displeasure of the archbishop. At least it is manifest, that this was the period at which the indignation of that prelate‡ first broke out; and in the December of the same year, the Pope himself (Alexander V.) issued some prohibitory decree against Huss and his followers.

The existence and circumstances of the great schism, and the obvious evils produced by it, had long been a popular theme of censure for the Bohemian reformer. And after its extinction, John XXIII. furnished him, in 1411, with fresh matter for reprehension. That pontiff sent forth

* Called the Chapel of Bethlehem. An opulent citizen of Prague had built and endowed it for the maintenance of two preachers, 'qui festis protestisque diebus verbum Dei Bohemico sermone plebibus insinuant.' *Æa. Sylv., Hist. Bohem., cap. xxxv.*

† The University, founded in 1347, by the Emperor Charles IV., was composed of four nations, Bohemia, Bavaria, Saxony, and Poland; and as the three last (even the last) were chiefly Germans, and had three votes, in four, three-fourths of the professors, doctors, &c., were Germans. On the other hand, in the economy of the University of Paris (where the division was also quadripartite) the natives had three voices. The declaration of King Wenceslas in favour of his subjects was made on Oct. 13, 1409.

‡ Subinco, Archbishop of Prague, is characterised by Maimbourg as 'a man who feared nothing when the service of God and the interests of the church were at stake.' Such a compliment, from the pen of Maimbourg, is at least suspicious.

his emissaries to preach a crusade against Ladislaus, King of Naples, and to accord the usual indulgences. The minds of many had been previously inflamed against this mockery of the cross of Christ by the preaching of Huss; and so it proved, that, on three several occasions, the pontifical missionaries were interrupted by violent exclamations in the midst of their harangues. Three offenders were accordingly seized by the order of the senate, and privately executed; but the blood which flowed from the prison into the street betrayed their fate. The people rose; and having gained possession of their bodies, carried them in procession to the various churches, chanting holy anthems. They then hurried them in the chapel of Bethlehem, with the aromatic offerings usually deposited on the tombs of martyrs. Other commotions followed; the clergy* of Bohemia conspired very generally against the principles of the reformer; and John XXIII. cited him, but without effect, before the tribunal of the Vatican. In fact, so great was the agitation which these disputes had now excited, that when the Council of Constance assembled presently afterwards, it issued an immediate summons for the appearance of Huss. With whatsoever disregard that ecclesiastic may have treated the mandate of the Pope, he proved, without hesitation, his allegiance to the council. He knew the hostility and the faithlessness of the court of Rome; but in the august representation of the Church, in the full congregation of holy prelates assembled for the reformation of abuses, and the redressing of wrongs, he might find some foundation for confidence, and some hope of justice.

It is proper now to examine, what was the nature of those spiritual offences which excited such attention throughout Christendom; and such terror among the directors *Opinions imputed to Huss.* of the Church. In the first place, the Bohemian innovator was accused of disseminating the mortal venom which he had imbibed from England. His devotion to the faith and memory of Wiclif, for it was for some years concealed, became at length too deep and ardent for dissimulation; and it is even related, that in his discourses from the pulpit of Bethlehem, he was wont to address his earnest vow to Heaven, that, whenever he should be removed from this life, he might be admitted to the same regions where the soul of Wiclif resided; since he doubted not, that he was a good and holy man, and worthy of a habitation in heaven†. It is certain, that on the first movement against Huss, the archbishop collected all the books of Wiclif, to the number of two hundred volumes, embossed and decorated with precious ornaments‡, and caused

* If we are to believe Æneas Sylvius (*Historia Bohemica*, cap. xxxv), the clergy, in the first instance, were favourable to Huss; and the reason, which he malignantly gives for that fact, seems to prove at least his own conviction of its truth. ‘Sequebantur Johannem clerici ferè omnes, ære alieno gravati, sceleribus et seditionibus insignes, qui rerum novitate evadere pœnas arbitrabantur. His et nonnulli doctrina celebres juncti erant; qui cum in ecclesia consequi dignitatem non potuissent, iniquo animo ferebant sacerdotia majorum censuum his committi, qui, quamvis nobilitate præirent, scientia tamen videbantur inferiores.’ The probability seems to be, that Huss may have won, in the beginning of his preaching, the partial support of the secular clergy by the bitterness with which he inveighed against monastic abuses; but that they deserted him, as soon as they saw his views more perfectly developed.

† ‘Qui, cum se liberè audiri animadverteret, multa de libris Wiclefi in medium attulit, asserens in iis omnem veritatem contineri; adjiciensque crebro inter prædicandum, se, postquam ex luce migraret, ea loca proficisci cupere, ad quæ Wiclefi anima pervenisset; quæm virum fuisse bonum, sanctum, cœloque dignum non dubitaret.’ Æn. Sylv., *Hist. Boh.*, l. xxxv.

‡ ‘Quorum major pars argenteis atque inauratis fibulis et pretiosis integumentis ornabatur.’ Harpsfield, ap. Contin. Fleury. Æneas Sylvius mentions the same fact nearly in the same words.

them to be publicly burnt. The same element, which consumed the writings of Wiclif, was destined to prey upon the body of his disciple; and it came like a signal, that his vow had been registered above, and that his master awaited his coming at the gates of Paradise.

It was another general charge against Huss, that he was 'infected with the leprosy' of the Vaudois: and that it may be seen how many gross offences were thought to be contained in this single accusation, we shall here follow the enumeration of *Æneas Sylvius*; only premising that many opinions are there ascribed to Huss, which, in his examinations before the council, he expressly disavowed. The most important among them were these—that the Pope is on a level with other bishops; that all priests are equal except in regard to personal merit; that souls, on quitting their bodies, are immediately condemned to eternal punishment, or exalted to everlasting happiness; that the fire of purgatory has no existence; that prayers for the dead are a vain device, the invention of sacerdotal avarice; that the images of God and the saints should be destroyed; that the orders of the mendicants were invented by evil spirits; that the clergy ought to be poor, subsisting on eleemosynary contributions; that it is free to all men to preach the word of God; that any one guilty of mortal sin is thereby disqualified for any dignity secular or ecclesiastical; that confirmation and extreme unction are not among the holy rites of the Church; that auricular confession is unprofitable, since confession to God is sufficient for pardon; that the use of cemeteries is without reasonable foundation, and inculcated for the sake of profit; that the world itself is the temple of the omnipotent God; and that those only derogate from his Majesty, who build churches, monasteries, or oratories; that the sacerdotal vestments, the ornaments of the altars, the cups and other sacred utensils, are of no more than vulgar estimation; that the suffrages of the saints who reign with Christ in Heaven are unprofitable, and vainly invoked; that there is no holiday excepting Sunday; that the festivals of the saints should by no means be observed; and that the fasts established by the Church are equally destitute of divine authority.

To these opinions, which he is accused of having habitually propounded in his chapel of Bethlehem, and of which he disclaimed many of the most important, he appears in truth to have subsequently added another, by no means calculated to conciliate the clergy. During a period of suspension from his preachings at Prague, he retired to his native village, and addressed to large rustic congregations the popular doctrine, that tithes are strictly eleemosynary, and that it is free for the owner of the land to withhold or to pay them, according to the measure of his charity. But the subject, on which the greatest heats were afterwards excited, and in which, indeed, the other points of difference were for the most part forgotten, was the distribution of the sacramental cup to the laity. And this innovation upon the modern practice of the Church is not, as it singularly happens, ascribed to Huss; though it originated in the same country, and at the same time. A celebrated preacher of the day, named *Jacobellus*, whose learning and piety are alike unquestioned*, first promulgated the tenet, that the communion in both kinds was necessary for salvation; and as the opinion was shown to rest not only on the authority of Scripture, but also on the practice of the ancient Church, 'the heretics embraced it with immoderate exultation, as evincing either the ignorance, or the wick-

* 'Per id tempus populum prædicando instruebat *Jacobellus Misnensis*, literarum doctrina et morum præstantia juxta clarus.' *Æn. Sylv.* loc. cit.

edness, of the Roman See." . . . Wenceslas, the King of Bohemia, regarded the rise of these principles with a careless and, as some assert, a stupid indifference; his queen protected the person, if she did not profess the principles, of her confessor; and thus the secular sword slept peacefully throughout these disputes, though it was loudly evoked by the zeal of the archbishop, and though Gerson * himself raised his voice to awaken it.

It has been matter of surprise to many writers, that Huss, with the consciousness that he had taught many of the above tenets, and with the knowledge how de- *The safe-conduct of Huss.* testable they were held by the churchmen, should have advanced so readily from a position of comparative security, and placed himself at once in the power of his enemies. It was not that he was ignorant of his danger. A letter, which he addressed to a friend immediately before his departure for Constance, contains passages almost prophetic of his imminent fate. He had the precaution, however, to obtain an act of safe-conduct † from the Emperor, which was understood to be a pledge for his personal safety during the whole period of his absence from Bohemia.

* Sufficient extracts from Gerson's Letter to the archbishop are given by Cochläus, *Historiæ Hussitarum*, lib. i., p. 21, (ed. Mogunt. 1549), and as it is curious to observe in what language the great Church Reformer of his day justified the principle of persecution, we shall cite some passages from it, only premising that, very nearly at the same moment, the Pope, John XXIII., was inditing an epistle to Wenceslas to the same purport. 'Inveniuntur adhuc hæreses extirpatæ ab agro ecclesiastico diversis viis, veluti falce multiplici. Inveniuntur quidem primitus extirpatæ falce vel acuto sarculo miraculorum, attestantium divinitus Catholicæ veritati, et hoc tempore apostolorum. Inveniuntur extirpatæ postmodum per falcem disputationis argumentativæ per doctores. Sunt extirpatæ deinde per falcem sacrorum Conciliorum, faventibus imperatoribus, quum disputatione doctrinalis particularium doctorum inefficax videbatur. Tandem accessit, velut in desperata peste, securis brachii secularis, excidens hæreses cum auctoribus suis et in ignem mittens. *Providens hac tanta severitate et misericordia, ut sic dicatur, crudelitate ne sermo talium, veluti cancer, serpat in perniciem tam propriam quam alienam.* Et ante multo tempore non sinere peccatoribus ex sententia agere, sed statim ultiones adhibere magni beneficii est indicium.' After showing that none of the ancient methods of extirpation were applicable to the existing heresy, he thus proceeds:—'Superest igitur, si de præmissorum nihil prosit, quod ad radicem infructuosam, immo MALEDICTÆ, arboris ponatur securis brachii secularis. Quale vos brachium invocare viis omnibus convenit, et expedit ad salutem omnium vobis creditorum.' . . . The doctrines attributed to Huss were condemned by the University of Paris, and the act was published with the signature of Gerson, as chancellor: it contains the following passage: 'For though there appears among the opinions of these heretics some zeal against the vices of the prelates, which in truth are very great and manifest, yet it is a zeal not sufficiently enlightened. A discreet zeal tolerates and deprecates the sins which it finds in the house of God, when it cannot wholly remove them. It would be impossible to correct vice by vice, and error by error; as the devil is not expelled by Beelzebub, but by the spirit of God, whose will it is that the correction of abuses be undertaken with great prudence and regard to circumstances of time and place.' This, too, is language which might very well have proceeded from the court of John XXIII.

† The following are given as the words of this frequently controverted 'safe-conduct':—'Honorabile magistram Johannem Huss, S. T. Baccalaureum, etc., de regno Boemie, in Concilium Generale . . . transeuntem . . . vobis omnibus et vestrum cuilibet pleno recommendamus affectu, desiderantes, quatenus ipsum, cum ad vos pervenerit, gratè suscipere . . . omnique prorsus impedimento remoto transire, stare, morari et redire liberè permittatis, sibi que et suis.'—(Act. Public. apud Bzovium, ann. 1414., sect. 17.) It is not at all obvious that the Council was bound by this safe conduct—the less so, as the professed object of Huss's journey was to clear himself of heresy in the presence and judgment of the Council: but the Emperor was certainly so bound; and that which he committed, and which the Council persuaded him to commit, was direct, unqualified treachery. It was manifestly the duty of Sigismund to receive Huss from the hands of the Council, and restore him to his native country; then the affair might have been taken up *de novo*, without any reflexion on the faith of any party. The best illustrations of the rights of this question are such facts, as prove the light in which it was viewed by succeeding generations. Thus we observe, that before the assembling of the first Diet of Worms

But that admirable Christian was unquestionably impelled by motives too deep for the calculation of ordinary minds. He felt an intense conviction of the truth of his doctrines, and he was resolved, should need be, to lay down his life for them. That conviction, attended by that resolution, gave a confidence to his character, which, while it left him without fear, might at the same time animate him with the highest hopes. He was filled with that deliberate enthusiasm, which sometimes raises the soul of man above that which we call wisdom; and which, while it provokes the sneer of ordinary beings, has produced those lofty deeds of disinterestedness and self-devotion, which redeem human nature.

Doubtless Huss was so influenced, when he published, both before his departure from Bohemia and during his journey, repeated challenges to all his adversaries to appear at Constance, and meet him in the presence of the Pope and the Council; 'If any shall there convict me of any error, of any doctrine contrary to the Christian faith, I refuse not (he proclaimed) to undergo the last penalties of heresy*.' These expressions betoken confidence in his own principles and in the integrity of the Council. He had yet to discover, that his controversy was not with candid opponents, contesting his avowed opinions, before an impartial tribunal; calumny and secret malice, and ecclesiastical bigotry, were more dangerous enemies; and his fate was seemingly irrevocable, from the moment in which he placed his life in the power of that Catholic assembly.

He was attended by some Bohemian noblemen, and he received the strongest assurances of protection from John XXIII. 'Though John Huss (said that Pope) should murder my own brother, I would use the whole of my power to preserve him from every injury, during all the time of his residence at Constance. . . . Nevertheless, within a month from his arrival, after having professed before a meeting of the Council his readiness to repel every charge, he was placed under a surveillance which was immediately changed to strict confinement. It should not be forgotten, that this first violation of the safe-conduct was peculiarly the act of the Council. Sigismund, who was not present, strongly remonstrated against it; and the Pope (from whatever motive†) disclaimed all share in the proceedings.

This advantage was instantly pursued by his enemies, of whom the most ardent were found among his countrymen; and accordingly

(1521), the Elector of Saxony privately required of the Emperor Charles V., a formal renunciation of the Decree of Constance—'that no faith be kept with heretics.' On the same occasion, we find that great pains were again taken by the Catholics to induce the Emperor to violate his safe-conduct to Luther; on which Louis, Elector Palatine, is recorded to have said—'That all Germany would not stain itself with the shame of public perfidy to oblige a few ecclesiastics;' and Charles himself to have uttered that celebrated apophthegm—'That if good faith were banished from the rest of the world, it should find refuge in the breast of kings.'—See Beausobre's Hist. Reform. liv. iii.

* 'Significo toti Boemix et omnibus nationibus, me velle sisti primo quoque tempore coram Concilio Constantiensi, in celeberrimo loco, presidente Papa, etc. . . . Eo confert pedem quisquis suspicionem de me habuerit, quod aliena a Christi fide docuerim vel defenderim. Item doceat ibi, adstante Papa, me ullo unquam tempore erroneam et falsam doctrinam tenuisse. Si me de errore aliquo convicerit, etc. . . non recusabo quascunque hæretici pœnas ferre.'—Huss, Bohemic., apud Bzovium, ad ann. 1414.

† Lenfant. Hist. Conc. Constant. lib. i. § xxviii.

‡ The cardinals were the agents in this affair; and John does not appear to have been present at that congregation. But we should not forget, that when Sigismund wrote to command the immediate liberation of Huss, on the strength of his own safe-conduct, the Pope opposed the execution of the order. Lenfant. Conc. Constant. l. i. § 59.

eight* articles of accusation were prepared, and presented to John XXIII. When a copy of them was delivered to the accused, where he lay sick in prison, he requested that an advocate might be granted him to defend his cause; but that was refused, on the plea of a general prohibition by the canon law to undertake the defence of any one suspected of heresy. And then, instead of striving to obviate the various intrigues which were employed for his destruction, he devoted the tedious leisure of his imprisonment, and the resources of a mind superior to ordinary agitations, to the composition of various moral and religious treatises †.

The next step in the process against him was the condemnation of the doctrines and memory of Wiclif. It was in the eighth session, held on the 4th of May, 1415, that a list of forty-five articles was drawn up, which embodied all (and more than all) the errors of that reformer; that it received the solemn censure of the fathers; and that the vengeance of that orthodox body pursued the spiritual offender even beyond the grave. It is a singular circumstance, and serves well to illustrate the position in which the Council then stood, as an assembly of reformation, that in the very sermon which opened that session, and which introduced the opinions of Wiclif to universal abhorrence, the Pope and his Court were treated with equal severity, and rebuked in language ‡ which would have been held blasphemous had it proceeded from the lips of a heretic.

It was an object of great importance with the council, bent, as it certainly was, on the destruction of Huss, and conscious, as it probably was, of the weakness of its own cause, to avoid the scandal of a public disputation. Accordingly, Huss was continually persecuted by private interrogatories, frequently accompanied by intimidation and insult; and depositions against his orthodoxy were collected with great diligence and great facility, since every kind of information was admitted against a suspected heretic. On the other hand, he vehemently remonstrated against this inquisitorial secrecy, and demanded for his defence an audience of the whole council. His Bohemian friends pressed the same point with equal earnestness. But in vain would they have solicited from that body this most obvious act of justice, if the emperor had not also been impressed with its propriety, and insisted with great firmness, that the trial should be public.

Consequently the fathers assembled very early in June for that purpose. The first charge was read. The defendant was called upon for his reply. But when he appealed in his justification to the authority of the Scrip- Tried.

* It seems almost unnecessary to enumerate these charges,—they were as follows :—(1) That communion in both kinds is necessary for salvation ;—(2) that the bread remains bread after the consecration ;—(3) that ministers in a state of mortal sin cannot administer the sacraments; and that any one in a state of grace can do so ;—(4) that the Church does not mean the Pope nor the clergy; that it cannot possess temporal goods, and that the secular powers can rightfully take them away ;—(5) that Constantine and other princes erred when they endowed the Church ;—(6) that all priests are equal in authority; so that ordinations and privileges reserved to the Popes and bishops are the pure effect of their ambition ;—(7) that the Church loses the power of the keys, when the Pope, cardinals, and the rest of the clergy are in mortal sin ;—(8) that excommunications may be disregarded with safety.

† On marriage—on the Decalogue—on the love and knowledge of God—on penitence—on the three enemies of man—on the Lord's Supper—and others.

‡ The Bishop of Toulon preached the sermon—‘ ubi puram dixit veritatem de Papa et cardinalibus.’ ‘ Benedicatur anima Domini Episcopi,’ de Papa dixit,—‘ *Maledicatur caro sua* ;’ et alibi verè—‘ *ita mentitur*, sicut si dicerem, Deus non est unus et trinus.’ The passage is found in a MS. of Vienna, and is cited by Lenfant. Conc. Const. lib. ii. § 59.

tures, and the venerable testimony of the fathers, his voice was drowned in a tumult of contempt and derision. He was silent; and it was interpreted as guilt. Again he spoke; again he was answered by disdainful jests and insults; and the assembly at length separated without any serious determination. The second audience was fixed for the 7th of June; and that greater decency might be preserved, the Emperor was requested to be present on that occasion. It is carefully recorded by historians, and not, perhaps, without some sense of superstitious awe, that the day, on which the fate of that righteous man was in fact decided, was signalised by a total eclipse of the sun—total, as was observed, at *Prague*, though not quite so at Constance. But the fathers were not moved by that phenomenon to any principle of justice, or any feeling of mercy. The various charges, already prepared, were pressed upon the culprit, less clamorously, indeed, but not less eagerly than before. His accusers were numerous and voluble, and armed with the most minute subtleties of the schools. Many among them were English; and these urged their arguments as warmly, as if they had thought to redeem the land of Wiclif by the prosecution of Huss, and to wash away the stains, which one heretic had cast upon them, in the blood of another.

Numerous depositions were likewise produced and read, alleging errors, which he had advanced in his writings or in his sermons, or even in his private conversations. Alone, and unsupported, save by two or three faithful Bohemians, and worn and enfeebled by confinement and disease, he presented a spirit which did not bend beneath this oppression. The opinions imputed to him, related chiefly to the Eucharist, and the condemned propositions of Wiclif. . . There were some which he entirely disavowed; others which he admitted under certain modifications; others which he professed his readiness and his ability to maintain. Among the first was the charge respecting transubstantiation. On which subject he repeatedly and unequivocally asserted his entire concurrence in the doctrine of the Church. Among the last, the positions (they were ascribed to Wiclif) to which he clung with the greatest pertinacity, appear to have been three. (1.) That Pope Sylvester and the Emperor Constantine did evil to the Church when they enriched it. (2.) That, if any ecclesiastic, whether Pope, prelate, or priest, be in a state of mortal sin, he is disqualified for the administration of the sacraments. (3.) That tithes are not dues, but merely eleemosynary. In defence of these, and perhaps some other opinions, the few arguments, which he was permitted to advance, were temperate, if not reasonable and scriptural: at least they proved his uprightness and the integrity of his heart; but they were received, as before, with reiterated shouts of derision. The question, indeed, was not, whether the opinions of Huss were founded in truth, or otherwise: that consideration seems not to have influenced any one mind in the whole assembly, excepting his own; the question really to be decided; the only question with which the council affected any concern, was, whether they were the doctrine of the Church. Whatsoever had once been pronounced by that infallible body was law, and the alternative was obedience or death.

On the following day Huss was admitted to the mockery of another and final audience; and on this occasion he was chiefly pressed on twenty-six articles, derived (fairly or unfairly) from his 'Book of the Church.' A scene similar to the preceding was terminated, on the part of the judges, by urgent solicitations to the accused to retract his errors. This act of submission was advised by several of the fathers; it was strongly recom-

mended by the Emperor; but Huss was unmoved. 'As to the opinions imputed to me, which I have never held, those I cannot retract; as to those which I do indeed profess, I am ready to retract them, when I shall be better *instructed* by the Council.' . . . The province of the Council was not to instruct, but to decide—to command obedience to its decision, or to enforce the penalty.

If Huss had hitherto nourished any reasonable hope of safety, it was placed in the moderation of the Emperor; but at this conjuncture, even that prospect was removed. For, towards the conclusion of the session, Sigismund delivered his un-qualified opinion, 'that among the errors of Huss, which had been in part proved, and in part confessed, there was not one which did not deserve the penal flames;' to which was added, 'that the temporal sword ought instantly to be drawn for the chastisement of his disciples, to the end that the branches of the tree might perish together with its root.'

Condemned.

Huss was again conducted to his prison, and thither was still pursued by fresh solicitations on his constancy; and that, which had stood firm before public menace and insult, might have yielded to private importunity, to bodily infirmity, to friendship, to solitude. First of all, an official formula of retraction was sent to him by the Council; it was express as to his abjuration of all the errors which had been proved against him, and as to his unconditional submission to the Council; but it was free from any harsh or offensive expressions. Huss calmly persisted in his resolution. 'He was prepared to afford an example in himself of that enduring patience, which he had so frequently preached to others, and which he relied upon the grace of God to grant him.' Many individuals, of various characters, but alike anxious to save him from the last infliction, visited his prison, and pressed him with a variety of motives and arguments; but they were all blunted by the rectitude of his conscience and the singleness of his purpose. One of his bitterest enemies, named Paletz*, was among the number; but, though his counsels had been successful in degrading the person of the reformer, they failed when they would have seduced him to infamy.

Numerous deputations were sent by the Council, to which he always replied with the same modesty and firmness, equally removed from an obstinate perseverance in acknowledged error, and a base retraction of that which he thought truth. About the same time it was resolved to commit his books to the flames, as if to warn him by that prelude of the approaching catastrophe. But in a letter which he wrote to some friend on the occasion, he remarked, that *that* was no ground for despondency, since the Books of Jeremiah had suffered the same indignity; but the Jews had not thus evaded the calamities, with which the prophet had menaced them.

Notwithstanding his public and recent declaration, the Emperor appears, even to the very conclusion of this iniquitous affair, to have entertained some lingering scruples respecting his safe-conduct. These had been silenced, it is true, by the sophistry of the doctors; and he had even been taught to believe, that his protection could not lawfully be extended to a man suspected of heresy; that monstrous charge superseded the ordinary economy of government, and dispensed with the imperious obliga-

* It was supposed that the spiritual influence of a confessor might possibly be sufficient to lead him to retract; and Huss requested that the same Paletz might be the person so commissioned—partly to prove, that he could pardon his worst enemy; partly to show, how willing he was to confide the inmost secrets of his heart, even to one who might be disposed to proclaim them most loudly. The Council did not think proper to accede to this generous request. It sent a monk to him, who gave him the same counsel as the others, and absolved him, without any penitential imposition.—See Lenfant's Hist. Conc. Const., liv. iii. § xxxv.

tions of moral duty! Howbeit, notwithstanding the spiritual authority on which this principle was advanced, Sigismond would have greatly preferred some reasonable compromise to that violent termination, which was now near at hand. Accordingly, when he saw the fruitlessness of every other attempt to bend the spirit of Huss, he resolved himself to make one final effort for the same purpose. On the 5th of July, on the eve of the day destined for his execution, the prisoner was visited by an imperial deputation, commissioned to inquire, 'whether he would abjure those articles of which he acknowledged himself guilty?' And in regard to those which he disavowed, 'whether he would swear that he held thereon the doctrine of the Church?' One objection, to which Huss had throughout attached great importance, was removed by this proposal—the obligation to *retract* that which he had never maintained. But the grand, the insurmountable difficulty still remained—to abjure against conviction that which he did actually profess. Upon the whole, he saw no reason for any change, and returned to the Emperor the same sort of answer with which he had met all preceding solicitations.

It remained for him still to encounter one other trial; if, indeed, we can so designate the upright counsel of a faithful and virtuous friend—for such was the circumstance, which completed and crowned the history of his imprisonment—and it should be everywhere recorded, for the honour of human nature. A Bohemian nobleman, named John of Chlum, had attended Huss, whose disciple he was, through all his perils and persecutions, and had exerted, throughout the whole affair, every method that he could learn or devise to save him. At length, when every hope was lost, and he was about to separate from the martyr for the last time, he addressed him in these terms: 'My dear master, I am unlettered, and consequently unfit to counsel one so enlightened as you. Nevertheless, if you are secretly conscious of any one of those errors, which have been publicly imputed to you, I do entreat you not to feel any shame in retracting it; but if, on the contrary, you are convinced of your innocence, I am so far from advising you to say anything against your conscience, that I exhort you rather to endure every form of torture, than to renounce anything which you hold to be true.' John Huss replied with tears, 'that God was his witness, how ready he had ever been, and still was, to retract on oath, and with his whole heart, from the moment he should be convicted of any error by *evidence from Holy Scripture*.*' . . . In the whole history of the sufferings and the fortitude of Huss, there is not one discoverable touch of pride or stubbornness; the records of his heroism are not infected by a single stain of mere philosophy; he was firm, indeed, but he was humble also; he expected death, and he feared it, too; he neither sought the Martyr's crown, nor affected the ambition of the Stoic: his principles of action were drawn from the same source as the articles of his belief; he was a pure and perfect Christian, and he thought it no merit to be so.

There was a long interval between his imprisonment and his audience, and again a tedious month intervened between his audience and execution. This period was passed in preparation to meet his fate, not in struggles to avoid it. 'God, in his wisdom, has reasons for thus prolonging my life.

* Huss, on the eve of his execution, wrote to the Senate of Prague to the following effect:—'Be well assured that I have not retracted or abjured one single article. The Council urged me to declare the falsehood of every article drawn from my books; but I refused, unless their falsehood could be demonstrated from Scripture. So do I now declare, that I detest every meaning which may be proved false in those articles, and I submit in that respect to the correction of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who knows the sincerity of my heart.' See Contin. of Fleury, l. ciii, lxxviii.

He wishes to give me time to weep for my sins, and to console myself in this protracted trial by the hope of their remission. He has granted me this interval, that, through meditation on the sufferings of Christ Jesus, I may become better qualified to support my own*.' The time of those sufferings at length arrived. On the morning of July 6, 1415, he was conducted before the Council, then holding its fifteenth session; and after various articles of accusation had been read, a sentence was passed to the following effect,—'That for several years John Huss has seduced and scandalized the people by the dissemination of many doctrines manifestly heretical, and condemned by the Church, especially those of John Wiclif. That he has obstinately trampled upon the keys of the Church and the ecclesiastical censures. That he has appealed to Jesus Christ as sovereign judge, to the contempt of the ordinary judges of the Church; and that such an appeal was injurious, scandalous, and made in derision of ecclesiastical authority†. That he has persisted to the last in his errors, and even maintained them in full Council. It is therefore ordained that he be publicly deposed and degraded from holy orders, as an obstinate and incorrigible heretic.' . . . The prelates appointed then proceeded to the office of degradation. He was stripped, one by one, of his sacerdotal vestments; the holy cup, which had been purposely placed in his hands, was taken from them; his hair was cut in such a manner as to lose every mark of the priestly character; and a crown of paper was placed on his head, marked with hideous figures of demons, and that still more frightful superscription, *Heresiarch*. The prelates then piously devoted his soul to the infernal devils‡; he was pronounced to be cut off from the ecclesiastical body, and being released from the grasp of the Church, he was consigned, as a layman, to the vengeance of the secular arm. It was in the character of 'advocate and defender of the Church,' that the Emperor took charge of the culprit, and commanded his immediate execution.

Sentenced,

and executed.

The last, which was not perhaps the bitterest, of his sufferings was endured with equal constancy and in the same blessed spirit. On his way to the stake he repeated pious prayers and penitential psalms; and when the order was given to kindle the flames, he only uttered these words—'Lord Jesus, I endure with humility this cruel death for thy sake; and I pray thee to pardon all my enemies.' The ministers executed their office; the martyr continued in uninterrupted devotion; and it was not long before a rising volume of fire and smoke extinguished at the same time his voice and his life. . . . His ashes were carefully collected and cast into the lake. But the miserable precaution was without any effect; since his disciples tore up the earth from the spot of his martyrdom, and adored it with the same reverence and moistened it with those same tears, which would otherwise have sanctified his sepulchre.

The points of difference strictly doctrinal between Huss and his persecutors were, after all, neither numerous nor important; since we are bound in this inquiry to give credit to the solemn disavowals of the accused, rather than to the malignant imputations of his accusers. Lenfant, in his

* Opera Joh. Huss., epist. 14, apud Lenfant.

† Probably, in the long list of Huss's imputed heresies there was no single article which inflamed the Council against him nearly so violently as this appeal. The point which, above all others, that assembly was interested to establish, was its own omnipotence and infallibility—its agency under the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit—in fact, its divine power. Consequently, an appeal to any superior, even though it were Christ himself, was derogatory to the heavenly attributes, with which the Council clothed itself.

‡ 'Animam tuam devovimus infernis Diabolis.'

accurate history* of this affair, has investigated very minutely the real extent of the offences of Huss, and reduced them under two heads. (1.) He unquestionably refused to subscribe to any general condemnation of the articles of Wiclif. There were many particulars on which he dissented from that reformer, but in several others he professed the same notions; and among these last were disparagement of the Pope and the Roman Church, and opposition to tithes, indulgences, and ecclesiastical censures. (2.) It was also made a dangerous charge against him, that the spirit of ecclesiastical insubordination, which had already appeared in Bohemia, was principally occasioned by his preaching. . . . Such was the burden of his offence. And though all the leading authors and orators of the time were as unsparing as Huss himself, in their denunciations of papal and ecclesiastical enormities, even from the pulpits of Constance; though it was even usual with them to ascribe to these abuses the heresies of the day; still the independent exertions of a Bohemian preacher in the same cause were stigmatized by them as indiscreet and immoderate zeal—because the principles, from which that zeal proceeded, were not in accordance with their own hierarchical pretensions; because the Bible, and not the Church, was the source from which it flowed. . . . And as to the disaffection of the Bohemians, if the Council really hoped to repress it by the perfidious execution of the most pious and popular of their teachers, the events, which presently followed, were a lesson of bloody and indelible instruction both to those who indulged that error, and to their latest posterity.

III. In less than a year from the execution of Huss, the same scene of injustice and barbarity was acted a second time, though with some variety of circumstances, in the same polluted theatre. Jerome, master in theology in the university of Prague, and a layman, was the disciple of John Huss. Huss (says *Æneas Sylvius*) was superior in age and authority; but Jerome was held more excellent in learning and eloquence. While the former presided in the chair, the latter delivered his lectures in the schools; and the same opinions were taught with equal zeal and effect by the one and by the other. In the troubles, which had been excited through those opinions, Jerome had had, perhaps, the greater share; there was at least no favourable feature to distinguish his offence from that of his master. Accordingly he was summoned to Constance soon after the meeting of the Council; and he appeared there on the 4th of April, 1415, not unprepared for the treatment which awaited him. It should be observed, that he also obtained a safe-conduct from the Emperor; but that in his case the conditional clause, *salva semper justitia*, was inserted; whereas that of Huss contained no such provision.

At his first audience (on May 23rd) he exhibited great firmness; but at the second, which took place only thirteen days after the execution of Huss, it was expected that the impression made by that frightful example would render him more tractable. And so assuredly it proved; for on his third examination (on September 11th) he submitted, after suffering much insult and intimidation, to make a formal and solemn retraction. He 'anathematized all heresies, and especially that of Wiclif and Huss with which he had been previously infected (*infamatus*); he denounced the various articles which expressed it, as blasphemous, erroneous, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, rash, and seditious; and professed his absolute adhesion to all the tenets of the Roman Church.' . . .

It was admitted that, in this mournful exhibition of human inconstancy, he had satisfied every demand which was made upon his weakness, both in

* Hist. Conc. Const. lib. iii. § 52, 60.

substance and in form; nevertheless he was still retained in confinement. After a short space, his enemies pressed forward with new charges against him. They found many eager listeners among the members of the Council; and Gerson * himself again took up the pen of bigotry, and again sought to dip it in blood. Matters continued thus until the 23rd of May, 1416, when a final and public audience was granted to his repeated entreaties. On this occasion he recalled, with sorrow and shame, his former retraction, and openly attributed the unworthy act to its real and only motive—the fear of a painful death. *His execution.*

His bitterest foes desired no further proof against him; and only seven days were allowed to elapse before he was condemned, and executed on the same spot which had been hallowed by the sufferings of his master. The courage, which had abandoned him in the anticipation of the flames, returned with redoubled force as he approached them. The executioner would have kindled the faggots behind his back: 'Place the fire before me,' he exclaimed; 'if I had dreaded it, I could have escaped it.' 'Such (says Poggio† the Florentine) 'was the end of a man incredibly excellent. I was an eye-witness to that catastrophe, and beheld every act. I know not whether it was obstinacy or incredulity which moved him; but his death was like that of some one of the philosophers of antiquity. Mutius Scævola placed his hand in the flame, and Socrates drank the poison with less firmness and spontaneousness, than Jerome presented his body to the torture of the fire.'

Whatsoever may have been the respective excellence, in their living or in their martyrdom, of those two venerable heralds of the Reformation, the conduct of the Council was not at all less iniquitous in respect to its second, than to its first victim. If in the one instance the violation of the safe-conduct displayed unblushing perfidy, the contempt of the retraction was at least as shameless in the other. The first crime was followed by no remorse; it seems rather to have led to the more calm and deliberate perpetration of the second. The *principle* by which the deeds were justified was never, for an instant, questioned in either case. And we should, at the same time, bear in mind (for it is a consideration deserving repeated notice), that this was not a principle exclusively papal—no peculiar emanation from the apostolical chair or the Court of Rome—it was a principle strictly ecclesiastical, animating the Council as the representative of the Church, and inflaming the individual bosom of the churchmen who composed it. It was embraced by the French and English, as warmly as by the Italians themselves; nor was it pressed to any greater extremity by the champions of ecclesiastical corruption, than by the men who called themselves its reformers.

* He composed at this time (in October, 1415) his treatise 'De Protestatione et Revocatione in Negotio Fidei, ad eluendam Hæreses notam.' He sought to cast suspicion on such retractions; and this was the first step towards the execution of Jerome. The Composition may be found in Von der Hardt, tom. iii. p. iv.

† In a letter addressed to Leonardus-Aretinus, of which the whole is valuable, as describing the entire transaction, and painting the character of Jerome. It is cited by Beausobre, *Histoire de la Réformation*, lib. ii.; by Von der Hardt, tom. iii. pars iii.; and other writers. There was, indeed, a little more of philosophical parade, and a little less of the genuine Christian spirit in the death of Jerome than in that of his master. Æneas Sylvius, however, whose eye was not likely to perceive this distinction, or to value it when perceived, includes both in the same sentence of admiration. 'Pertulerunt ambo constanti animo necem et quasi ad epulas invitati ad incendium properarunt, nullam emittentes vocem, quæ miseri animi posset facere indicium. Ubi ardere cøperunt, hymnum cecinerunt, quem vix flamma et fragor ignis interciperet potuit. Nemo Philosophorum tam forti animo mortem pertulisse traditur, quam isti incendium.' *Hist. Bohem. cap. xxxvi.*

IV. The condition of Bohemia is described to have been singularly flourishing at that moment. There was no other region * more abundant in useful productions, or in which the people were blessed with greater comforts; none more distinguished for the splendour of its churches and monasteries, and the wealth of its clergy. Unhappily, that body had used with little moderation the advantages enjoyed by it; and its excesses had for many years excited the murmurs of the laity. This disaffection had even shown itself in occasional outrages; but no systematic hostility had yet been arrayed either against the persons or the property of the sacred order. Howbeit, no sooner were the proceedings of the Council made known throughout the country, than the people gave indications of a ferocious spirit; the nobles † likewise addressed a bold remonstrance to the fathers; and as their rising opposition was met by new edicts ‡ of condemnation, which still farther inflamed it; and as Martin V. at length published a Bull § of Crusade against the contumacious heretics, every hope of reconciliation was removed, and the difference was fairly committed to the decision of the sword.

It was one of the earliest and most innocent acts of insubordination to spread three hundred tables in the open air, for the public celebration of the communion in *both* kinds||. And as the sense of some one specific grievance is necessary for the union of a large multitude in revolt against any established power, so it was wise in the Bohemian insurgents to select one among their spiritual wrongs, as the principal motive of resistance, and to select that which would be most intelligible to the lowest classes. Again, the distinction of a name was useful in rousing enthusiasm, and preserving the show of concord. And so this *chosen people*

* Cochläus (lib. i. p. 314) cites some verses 'Conradi Celtis primi apud Germanos Poetæ Laureati,' in praise of the city of Prague:—

Visa non est Urbs meliore cælo;
Explicat septem hæc spatiosa colles,
Ambitu murorum imitata magnæ
Mœnia Romæ.

† They had previously addressed several remonstrances to the Emperor on the subject of Huss's imprisonment, representing that there was no person, great or small, who did not see the violation of his safe-conduct with indignation. Their letter to the Council immediately followed the execution of Huss, and was dated September 2. The great considered the act as an affront to the kingdom of Bohemia; the populace exclaimed against the fathers, as persecutors and executioners, and assembling in the chapel of Bethlehem, decreed to the victim the honours of martyrdom. It is related, that Jerome of Prague was prematurely associated with his master in this popular canonization; and it is remarkable that this crown was conferred upon him within a few days from that, on which he made his retraction.

‡ Among the edicts published at Constance against the Hussites, there was one, in 1418, which prohibited the singing of songs in derision of the Catholic Church.

§ The Bull published by Martin in 1421 contained a prohibition to keep faith with heretics, as distinctly conveyed as words can express it,—'Quod si tu aliquo modo inductus defensionem eorum suscipere promisiisti; scito te dare fidem hæreticis, violatoribus Fidei Sanctæ, non potuisse, et idcirco peccare mortaliter, et servabis; quia fidei ad infidelem non potest esse ulla communio.' It is addressed to Alexander, Duke of Lithuania, and published by Cochläus, a prejudiced Catholic. Lib. v. p. 212.

||After all, it appears nearly certain, that Huss was not the author of the restoration of the cup. Lenfant follows the account of Æneas Sylvius, and argues that he was not. The retrenchment of the cup appears to that author to be a necessary consequence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which Huss seems to have professed to the last. The Catholics of Constance, and even Gerson himself, (for he published a very elaborate and artificial treatise on the subject,) appear to have been more perplexed in the defence of this, than of any other of their abuses. Antiquity, of course, is the great object of appeal; and yet the antiquity of this practice could scarcely reach two centuries (Lenfant, liv. iii., § xxxi.); and it certainly never acquired the force of a law till the contrary was declared to be heresy, in the 10th Session of the Council (May 14, 1415).

stigmatised the surrounding nations as Idumæans or Moabites, as Amalekites or Philistines; themselves were the well-beloved and elect of God; Thabor was the mount on which they pitched their tents, and Thaborite the appellation which they adopted. The first effects of their indignation were directed against the monks and clergy. These were plundered and even massacred without pity and without remorse. The sacred buildings were overthrown, the sanctuaries profaned, the altars stained with blood; and all those abominations were unsparingly committed, which commonly attend a premature resistance to inveterate oppression.

Sigismond conducted the armies of the Church; Zisca led the rebels against them; and the name of Zisca is signalised by several triumphs over the imperial crusaders, *Their triumphs.* which evinced not only his great military genius and resolution, but the deep religious enthusiasm and devotion of his followers. Atrocities were perpetrated by both parties, as if in emulation of each other, and of the heroes of former holy wars; and so keen was the thirst for blood, that the Hussites indulged it in the massacre of a sect of brother-heretics. A number of unfortunate enthusiasts, usually designated Adamites, were collected in an insular spot, in the neighbourhood of Zisca's encampment. They are accused by various writers of the habit of nudity, and of many scandalous crimes; and in this matter it is probable that they have been much calumniated. It may be, as Mosheim is disposed to think, that they were infected with some of the absurdities of mysticism; or, as Beausobre* learnedly argues, that their difference from the Catholics was confined to the use of the cup. It is beyond dispute, that they did not maintain all the opinions of the Thaborites; and it would seem that some fatal quarrels had taken place between individuals of the two sects. Zisca surrounded and destroyed them without any discrimination or mercy; but lest we should on this account consider him as having surpassed the wickedness of his Catholic adversaries, we may remark, that by this very act he has incurred the deliberate praise of their historians†, and redeemed in their eyes some portion of the guilt of his apostasy.

Zisca died in 1424, and divisions immediately ensued among his followers. Two other factions, the Orebiters and the Orphans, distracted the Bohemian reformers; *Divisions.* but they united on occasions of common danger. In 1431 they repelled another formidable crusade, which was conducted by the celebrated cardinal of St. Angelo; and in this affair the rout was so complete, that the Pope's Bull, as well as the hat, cross, and bell of the cardinal, fell into the hands of the victors‡. In the meantime, a more moderate party arose and acquired influence among the Hussites; its hopes were turned to a pacific accommodation with the Church; and with that view it was arranged, that the Bohemians should send deputies to treat with the council of Basle. . . Accordingly some of the most renowned among their military and ecclesiastical directors appeared at that city on the day appointed. The fame of their fierce exploits made them objects of deep and fearful curiosity with that peaceful assembly; they were treated with respect, for they had earned it by their sword; and no

* This very ingenious writer, in his dissertation on the 'Adamites,' addressed in two books to M. Lenfant, and published together with the 'History of the Council of Constance' by the latter, certainly clears the Adamites from the worst charges that have been brought against them, which he shows to have been Catholic calumnies. Still the question, why Zisca destroyed them, is scarcely answered satisfactorily.

† See Cochleus, lib. v., p. 218. ‡ See Lenfant, Guerre des Hussites, l. xvi. s. v. &c.

violation of their safe-conduct, or other breach of faith, was on this occasion meditated.

They were introduced, on February 16, 1433, to a general meeting of the fathers, and immediately proposed the conditions of reconciliation, which were four in number*.

Embassy to Basle. (1.) The use of the cup in the administration of the sacrament. (2.) The free preaching of the word of God. (3.) The abolition of the endowments of the clergy. (4.) The punishment of heinous transgressions and mortal sins. A separate debate was then opened upon each of these articles; and John of Rokysan, the most conspicuous among the Hussite divines, commenced by a defence of the double communion, which lasted for three entire mornings. He was afterwards answered by John of Ragusa, an ingenious Dominican, who so far surpassed the prolixity of his opponent, as to occupy eight mornings in the delivery of his arguments †; six others were then consumed by the reply of Rokysan. The other subjects were contested with scarcely less tediousness; and when the debate had thus continued for nearly two months, and when it was found that, so far from any progress having been made towards accommodation, the obstinacy of both parties was only confirmed and inflamed, the Duke of Bavaria, the secular protector of the council, sought for other expedients to bring them to terms. But in this attempt he failed likewise; and after the Catholics had advanced some counter-propositions, which were rejected by the Hussites, the conference terminated, and the deputies returned to recount to their compatriots the failure of their mission.

But the Catholics, being now better informed as to the variety and nature of the dissensions which divided their opponents, thought to profit by that circumstance, if they should carry the controversy into the hostile territories; a solemn embassy was accordingly appointed to proceed to Prague. Negotiations were again opened; and again the Catholics essayed the arts of persuasion in vain. They then introduced such amendments into the four articles as effectually destroyed their force, or altered their meaning; but these were firmly rejected by the larger and more determined portion of the separatists. There existed, however, among these last, a more moderate and very influential party, which was strongly disposed to waive all other subjects of

The Calixtines. complaint, provided the double communion were fairly conceded by the Church. These were called Calixtines ‡—from the *chalice* § to which their demands were con-

* According to Cochläus (lib. v., p. 205), these were first agreed upon in a general assembly “Baronum terræ Bohemiæ et Moraviæ, et dominorum inclytæ urbis Pragensis, militarium, clientum, civitatum et communitatum,” A.D. 1421. This will account for the moderation of the demands contained in them.

† It is observed that John of Ragusa gave great offence to his opponents by the frequent use of the word *heresy*, as applied to their opinions. With them it was still a question whether it was not the Church which was in heresy; with the Dominican, the Church was infallible. With them it was error to differ from the Scripture; with John, to differ from the Church. Thus the term, taken in a different sense, was as obnoxious in their eyes as in those of the Dominican.

‡ Cochläus (lib. v., p. 192) mentions early differences between the *Magistri Pragenses* and the *Thaborites*. The former were the more moderate Dissenters; the Church Hussites and Jacobellus Misnensis, Rokysan, and other distinguished reformers, belonged to them. But the *Thaborites*, who were the Puritans, and also the soldiers of the party, had Zisca with them, and the two *Procopiuses*—both eminent warriors—so that they were for some time the stronger faction.

§ Tot pingit calices Bohemorum Terra per urbes,

Ut credas Bacchi numina sola coli—

is a contemporary distich. It should be observed, that every other picture was an object of aversion, at least to the more rigid reformers.

fined—and they were distinguished from the Thaborites, who constituted the more violent faction; and the sum of whose grievances was by no means comprehended in the four articles, though they might consent in their public deliberations to suppress the rest. Among the Calixtins were several of the substantial citizens and leading members of the aristocracy; and of such too the Catholic party was chiefly composed. As these, next after the clergy, were the principal sufferers by the continuance of anarchy and the devastations of war, they entered without much difficulty into the designs of the council. And since it was now obvious, that no reconciliation was to be expected from discussion, it was determined to make another appeal to the sword.

A civil war was immediately kindled throughout the country (in 1434); the party of the council was directed with ability by a distinguished Bohemian, named Maynard: *Renewal of War.* his schemes were at first advanced by dissensions which raged between the Thaborites and the Orphans; and he afterwards conducted matters with so much address, that he engaged them when united, and entirely overthrew them. On this occasion it so happened, that the most hardened and desperate among the insurgents fell alive into the power of the conquerors; and as they were numerous, and objects, even in their captivity, of fearful apprehension, Maynard resolved to use artifice for their destruction. Among the prisoners there were also several, who were innocent of any previous campaigns against the Church, and who were neither hateful as rebels, nor dangerous as soldiers. These it was the design of the Catholics to spare; and the better to distinguish them from the veterans of Zisca, they caused it to be proclaimed, that the government intended to confer honours and pensions on the more experienced warriors, the heroes of so many fields. These were accordingly invited to separate themselves from their less deserving companions, and to withdraw to some adjacent buildings, where more abundant entertainment and a worthier residence were prepared for them. They believed these promises; and then it came to pass (says Æneas* Sylvius), 'that many thousands of the Thaborites and Orphans entered the barns assigned to them; they were men blackened, and inured and indurated against sun and wind; hideous and horrible of aspect; who had lived in the smoke of camps; with eagle eyes, locks uncombed, long beards, lofty stature, shaggy limbs, and skin so hardened and callous as to seem proof, like mail, against hostile weapons. The gates were immediately closed upon them; fire was applied to the buildings; and by their combustion, that ignominious band, the dregs and draft of the human race, at length made atonement in the flames, for the crimes which it had perpetrated, to the religion which it had insulted.' . . . Among the crimes with which the Thaborites are reproached, was there any more foul than that, by which they perished? or can any deeper insult be cast on the religion of Christ, than to offer up human holocausts in his peaceful name? In the balance of religious atrocities the mass of guilt must rest at last with those, who established the practice of violence, and consecrated the principles of Antichrist.

But the adversaries of Rome were not thus wholly extirpated: under the spiritual direction of Rokysan, they were still so considerable, that Sigismund did not disdain to negotiate with them. The result was, that a concordat or compact was concluded at Iglau in the year 1436, by

* Hist. Bohem., cap. li., ad finem.

which the Bohemians conceded almost all their claims; but in return, the use of the cup was conceded to them, not as an essential practice, but only through the indulgence of the Church*. Some arrangement was likewise made respecting the ecclesiastical property, which had been despoiled by the rebels. This affair was conducted with the countenance of the Council. The first result was favourable; and the contest with Rome might then, perhaps, have ceased; the Bohemians, fatigued with tumult and bloodshed, might have returned to the obedience of the Church, contented with one almost nominal concession, if the chiefs of the hierarchy could have endured any independence of thought or action, any shadow of emancipation from their immitigable despotism. For this was, in fact, the spirit which guided the Councils of Rome; it was not the attachment to any particular tenet or ceremony, which moved her to so much rancour; but it was her general hatred of intellectual freedom, and the just apprehensions with which she saw it directed to the affairs of the Church.

In September, 1436, Sigismund made his entry into Prague, amid congratulations almost universal; and the calamities which had desolated the country for two-and-twenty years appeared to be at an end†. But the Pope refused his assent to the concordat; he refused to confirm the appointment of Rokysan to the See of Prague, though the Emperor had promised it; and though all the factions of the people were united in desiring it. Wherever the guilt of the previous dissensions may have rested, henceforward we need not hesitate to impute it wholly to the Vatican. Legates and mendicant emissaries‡ continued to visit the country, and contend with the divines, and tamper with the people. Even Pius II., whose personal §

* The Council of Basle, in its thirtieth session, published its Decree on the Eucharist, in which are these words:—‘Sive autem sub una specie sive duplici quis communicet, secundum ordinationem seu observationem Ecclesie, proficit digne communicantibus ad salutem.’ Cochläus, lib. viii. p. 308. Communicants might be saved according to either method, so long as that method was sanctioned by the Church.

† The appointment of a double administrator of the Sacrament in every Church, one for the Catholic, the other for the Separatist, was of somewhat later date. Lenfant places it in 1441, and mentions that great good proceeded from it.

‡ The most celebrated among these papal missionaries was John Capistano, a Franciscan, who had gained great distinction in a spiritual campaign against the Fratricelli in the Campagna di Roma and March of Ancona, and had condemned thirty-six of them to the flames. . . . He is described by Cochläus (lib. x. ad finem) as a little emaciated old man, full of fire and enthusiasm, and indefatigable in the service of the Church. The year of his exertions in Bohemia was 1451. Such emissaries were in those days among the most useful tools of the Roman hierarchy.

§ It was in 1451 that Æneas Sylvius made his celebrated visit to Bohemia, as imperial envoy. His mission was merely political; but it deserves our notice from the very interesting description which he has drawn of the manners of the Thaborites, among whom he found an asylum when in some danger from bandits:—‘It was a spectacle worthy of attention. They were a rustic and disorderly crew, yet desirous to appear civilized. It was cold and rainy. Some of them were destitute of all covering except their shirts; some wore tunics of skin; some had no saddle, others no reins, others no spurs. One had a boot on his leg, another none. One was deprived of an eye, another of a hand; and to use the expression of Virgil, it was unsightly to behold

—— populataque tempora raptis

Auribus et truncos inhonesto vulnere nares.

There was no regularity in their march, no constraint in their conversation; they received us in a barbarous and rustic manner. Nevertheless, they offered us hospitable presents of fish, wine and beer. . . . On the outer gate of the city were two shields; on one of them was a representation of an angel holding a cup: as it were to exhort the people to this communion in wine,—on the other Zisca was painted an old man, blind of both eyes. . . . whom the Thaborites followed, not only after he had lost one eye, but when he became a perfectly blind leader. Nor was there inconsistency in this, etc.’—(See his 130th Letter.) In the mean time these wild and unseemly sectarians nourished in their

intercourse with the sectarians had not softened his ecclesiastical indignation at their disobedience, exhibited in his negotiations with Pogebrac*, the king, an intolerant and resentful spirit. And at length Paul II., his successor, once more found means to light up a long and deadly war in the infected country. It was considered, no doubt, as a stigma upon the Church, which all occasions and instruments were proper to efface, that a single sect should anywhere exist, which dared to differ from the faith or practice of Rome on a single article, and which maintained its difference with impunity.

It was in 1466 that Paul II. excommunicated and deposed Pogebrac, and transferred the kingdom to the son of Huniades. In that object he was not successful; but *The Bohemian brothers*, during the discords of almost thirty years which followed, the offensive names of Thaborite, Orphan, and even Hussite, gradually disappeared, and the open resistance to the Catholic predominance became fainter and fainter. But the principles were so far from having expired in this conflict, that they came forth from it in greater purity, and with a show of vigour and consistency, which did not at first distinguish them. Early in the ensuing century, about the year 1504, a body of sectarians, under the name of the 'United Brethren of Bohemia,' begins to attract the historian's notice. Beausobre† affirms, that this association was originally formed in the year 1467; that it separated itself at that time from the Catholics and Calixtines, and instituted a new ministry; that it made application to the Vaudois, in order to receive through them the true apostolical ordination; and that Stephen, a bishop of that persuasion, did actually ordain Matthew, the first bishop of the 'United Brethren.' It is unquestionable, that those among the Thaborites, and the other more determined dissenters, who had escaped the perils of so many disasters, continued with uncompromising constancy to feed and mature the tenets for which they had suffered; and that many of the leading articles of the Reformation were anticipated and preserved by the 'Bohemian Brothers.' It is also true, that the evangelical principles of their faith were not unmixed with some erroneous notions; but it is no less certain, that when Luther was engaged in the accomplishment of his mission, he was welcomed by a numerous body of hereditary reformers, who rejected, and whose ancestors had rejected, the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, transubstantiation, prayers for the dead, the adoration of images; and who confirmed their spiritual emancipation by renouncing the authority of the Pope ‡.

rude abodes opinions, which were the glory of the following age, but which were indeed pernicious to themselves. Exactly seven years after the visit of Æneas Sylvius, the King of Bohemia, Pogebrac, willing to bring them to more moderate sentiments of reform, summoned a General Council of Hussites, who condemned some of their tenets; and then, on their refusal to abjure them, the King assaulted Thabor, and destroyed them (as it is related) with such scrupulous exactness, that not one was left alive.

* Pogebrac was a moderate reformer, a Calixtine; he was extremely anxious to be subject to the Church, on the condition only, that it would leave him the cup: he had been brought up, as he said, in that practice, and would never resign it. His persecution of the Thaborites sufficiently proves how far he was from any anti-ecclesiastical tendency. Yet he seems to have been as much hated at Rome, as if he had gone to the full extent of opposition, and he was certainly much less feared. The Pope had still a powerful party among the aristocracy of Bohemia.

† Dissertation sur les Adamites. Part I.

‡ Bossuet (in the eleventh chapter of his *Variations*) consumes his ingenuity in endeavouring to show that the 'Bohemian Brethren' were descended from the Calixtines, not from the Thaborites, and had thus only one point of doctrinal difference with Rome. But, at the same time, he admits their *disobedience*—'Voilà comme ils sont disciples de

CHAPTER XXVI.

History of the Greek Church after its Separation from the Latin.

Origin, progress, and sufferings of the Paulicians—They are transplanted to Thrace, and the opinions gain some prevalence there—Their differences from the Manichæans—and from the Church—Six specific errors charged against them by the latter—Examined—Points of resemblance between the Paulicians and the Hussites—Mysticism at no time extinct in the East—and generally instrumental to piety—Introduction of the mystical books into the West—Opinions of the Echetes or Mesallians—Those of the Hesychasts or Quietists—who are accused before a Council, and acquitted—The mixed character of the heresy of the Bogomiles—Controversy respecting the God of Mahomet—terminated by a compromise—Points of distinction between the two Churches—Imperial supremacy constant in the East—Absence of feudal institutions—Superior civilization of the Greeks—They never received the False Decretals, nor suffered from their consequences—Passionate reverence for antiquity—Animosity against the Latins—Hopes from foundation of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem—Its real consequences—Establishment of a Latin Church in the East—Influence of the military orders—Legates *a latere*—Latin conquest of Constantinople—confirmed by Innocent III.—A Latin Church planted and endowed at Constantinople—Tithes—Dissensions of the Latin ecclesiastics—Increasing animosity between the Greeks and Latins—Secession of the Greek hierarchy to Nice—Mission from Rome to Nice—Subject and heat of the controversy, and increased rancour—John of Parma subsequently sent by Innocent IV.—Extinction of the Latin empire—The Church does not still withdraw its claims—Subsequent negotiations between the Emperor and the Pope—Confession of Clement IV.—Conduct of the Oriental Clergy—Ambassadors from the East to the Second Council of Lyons—Concession of the Emperor presently disavowed by the Clergy and People—Subsequent attempts at reconciliation—Arrival of the Emperor and Patriarch at Ferrara—First proceedings of the Council—Private deliberations by Members of the two churches—The four grand Subjects of Division—The Dispute on Purgatory—Doctrine of the Latins—of the Greeks—First Session of the Council—Grand Disputations on the Procession—The Council adjourned to Florence, and the same Discussions repeated there—Suggestions of compromise by the Emperor, to which the Greeks finally assent—The common Confession of Faith—A Treaty, by which the Pope engages to furnish Supplies to the Emperor—The Union is then ratified—The manner in which the other differences, as the Azymes, Purgatory, and the Pope's Primacy, are arranged—Difficulty as to the last—How far the subject of Transubstantiation was treated at Florence. On the fate of Cardinal Julian—Return of the Greeks—Their angry reception—Honours paid to Mark of Ephesus—Insubordination of three Patriarchs—Russia also declares against the Union—Critical situation of the Emperor—The opposite Party gains ground—The prophetic Address of Nicholas V. to the Emperor Constantine—Perversity and Fanaticism of the Greek Clergy—They open Negotiations with the Bohemians—Tumult at Constantinople against the Emperor and the Pope's Legate—Fall of Constantinople—*Note.* On the Armenians—and Maronites.

WHILE the jealousies, which had so long disturbed the ecclesiastical concord of the east and west, were ripened into open schism by the mutual violence of Nicholas and Photius*, the Eastern Church was in the crisis of a dangerous contest with a domestic foe. A sect of heretics named Paulicians had arisen in the seventh century, and gained great prevalence in the Asiatic provinces, especially Armenia. It was in vain that they were assailed by imperial edicts and penal inflictions. Constans, Justinian II., and even Leo the Isaurian successively chastised their errors or their contumacy; but they resisted with inflexible fortitude, until at length Nicephorus, in the beginning of the ninth century, relented from the system of his predecessors, and restored the factious dissenters to their civil privileges, and religious liberty.

During this transient suspension of their sufferings, they gained strength to endure others, more protracted and far more violent. The oppressive edicts were renewed by Michael Curopalates, and redoubled by Leo the Armenian; as if that resolute Iconoclast wished to make

Jean Huss. Morceau rompu d'un morceau, schisme séparé d'un schisme—Hussites divisés des Hussites; et qui n'en avoient presque retenu, que la désobéissance et la rupture avec l'Eglise Romaine.

* We refer the reader to the 12th chapter of this History.

amends to bigotry, for his zeal in the internal purification of the Church, by his rancour against its sectarian seceders. The struggles, the victories, and the misfortunes of that persecuted race are eloquently unfolded in the pages of Gibbon: we shall not transfer the narrative to this history, for it belongs not to our purpose to trace the details even of religious warfare. It may suffice to say, that the sword, which was resumed by the enemy of the Images, was most fiercely wielded by their most ardent patroness; and that, during the fourteen years of the reign of Theodora, about 100,000 Paulicians are believed to have perished by various methods of destruction. The conflict lasted till nearly the end of the century; and, at length, the survivors either sought for refuge under the government of the Saracens, or were transplanted by the conqueror into the yet uncontaminated provinces of Bulgaria and Thrace. But not thus were the doctrines silenced, or the spirit extinguished. The fierce exiles carried with them into their new habitations the sectarian and proselytizing zeal; and the errors of the East soon took root and flourished in a ruder soil. During the tenth and eleventh centuries the Paulicians of Thrace were sufficiently numerous to be objects of suspicion, if not of fear; and in the latter we find it recorded, that Alexius Comnenus did not disdain to employ the talents and learning, with which he adorned the purple, in personal controversy with the heretical doctors. Many are related to have yielded to the force of the imperial eloquence; many also resigned their opinions on the milder compulsion of rewards and dignities; but those who, being unmoved by either influence, pertinaciously persisted in error and disloyalty, were corrected by the moderate exercise of despotic authority*.

After this period we find little mention of the Paulician sect in the annals of the Oriental Church. But we should remark that Armenia, the province of its birth, was never afterwards cordially reconciled to the See of Constantinople; and that, though it no longer fostered that particular heresy, it continued to nourish some seeds of disaffection, which frequently recommended it in later ages to the interested affection of the Vatican.†

It is generally much easier to describe the fortunes of a suffering sect than to ascertain the offence for which they suffered. The resistance of the Paulicians, their bravery, their *Opinions of the Paulicians.* cruelty, their overthrow, are circumstances of unquestionable assurance; the particulars of their opinions are disputed. By their enemies, they were at once designated as Manichæans—it was the name most obnoxious to the Eastern as well as the Western Communion: yet, if we may credit contemporary testimony‡, they earnestly disclaimed the imputation. The truth is, that they are only

* They were removed to Constantinople, and placed in a sort of honourable exile in the immediate precincts of the imperial palace. Anna Comnena (Alexiad, b. xiv.) describes with filial ardour her father's zeal and patience in converting these *Manichæans*. *Τῷ μὲν πατρὶς τοῦ βασιλέως ἰνίκαι, τοῖς δὲ λόγοις ἰχυροῦτο τοὺς ἀντιθέτους. ὅσπερ δὲ τότε κατὰ τῶν Μανιχαίων ἐξῆλθοσαν, ἀποστολικὴν ἀντὶ στρατηγικῆς ἀναδιζήμενος ἀγωνίαν—καὶ ἔργον τοῦτον τρισημίδικοτον ἂν ἀποστολὴν ἐνομάζαιμι . . . ἀπὸ πρώτης οὐν μέχρι δεύτης ἰώας ἢ καὶ ἰστίρας, ὅστιν οὐ καὶ δυοτίρας καὶ τρίτης φυλακῆς τῆς νυκτὸς μεταπημπύωνος αὐτοῖς, &c. &c.*

† See the Note at the end of this chapter.

‡ 'Idem sunt (says Petrus Siculus, page 764) nec quicquam divertunt à Manichæis Pauliciani, qui hasce recens a se procusas hæreses prioribus assuerunt, et ex sempiterno exitii barathro effuderunt: qui, tametsi se a Manichæorum impuritatibus alienos dicunt, sunt tamen dogmatum ipsorum vigilantissimi custodes, &c.' 'Historia de Manichæis;' a Latin translation of which is published in the Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum Veterum; tom,

known, like so many other sects, through the representations of their adversaries*. These have been investigated by Moshelm† with his usual care and impartiality, and the result of his inquiry may be received with as much confidence as is consistent with the nature of the evidence.

The most obvious difference between the Paulicians and Manichæans related to the ecclesiastical profession and discipline. The former rejected the government by bishops, priests, and deacons (to which the Manichæans adhered), and admitted no order or individuals set apart by exclusive consecration for spiritual offices. Neither did the authority of councils or synods enter into their system of religious polity. They had, indeed, certain doctors, called *Synecdemi*, or *Notarii*; but these were not distinguished by any peculiar dignities or privileges, either from each other or from the body of the people. The only singularity attending their appointment was, that they changed, on that occasion, their lay for scriptural names. They received all the books of the New Testament, except the two Epistles of St. Peter; and the copies of the Gospel in use among them were the same with those authorized by the Church, and free from the numerous interpolations imputed to the Manichæans.

The peculiarities already mentioned may appear alone sufficient to have excited the animosity of the established clergy of the East; but these were by no means the only offences objected to the Paulicians by the Church writers. These last, without professing to give a perfect delineation of the monstrous system of the Heretics, are contented to charge them with six detestable errors: 1. That they denied that either the visible world or the human body was the production of the Supreme Being; and distinguished their Creator from the most High God who dwells in the heavens. 2. That they treated contemptuously the Virgin Mary. 3. That they disparaged the nature and institution of the Lord's Supper‡. 4. That they loaded the cross of Christ with contempt and reproach. 5. That they rejected, after the example of the greatest part of the Gnostics, the books of the Old Testament, and looked upon the writers of the Sacred History as inspired by the Creator of the world, not by the Supreme God. 6. That they excluded Presbyters and Elders from all part in the administration of the Church§.

xvi., ann. 860—900. The expressions of Photius are 'Μηδὲς δ' ἡσθεὺς μί' ἑς ἑτέρας βλάστησαι δύναται, καὶ ἢ ὑπὸ ζῶντι ὁ Σάμαχος Μάνης, τὸν παραφύλαδα ταύτης τοῦ δουρεῖον βασιλεὺς δογματῶν μία γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ ἀντὶ, &c.' (*Διήγησις*, &c., published in the *Bibliotheca Coisliana* (Paris, 1715) page 349.

* The books from which our best accounts of the Paulicians are derived, are Photius (*Διήγησις τῶν νεφελεῶν Μανιχαίων κατεβλαστήσεως*), and Petrus Siculus (*Historia de Manichæis*). By the account of Petrus Siculus we learn, that, in the year 870, under the reign of Basilus the Macedonian, he was sent as ambassador to the Paulicians at Tibrice, to treat with them concerning the exchange of prisoners, and that he lived among them for nine months.

† Cent. ix. p. 2. chap. v.

‡ The words of Petrus Siculus are—'Quod divinam et tremendam corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri conversionem negent, aliaque de hoc mysterio doceant—A Domino nempe non panem et vinum in cœna discipulis propinatum, sed figuratè symbola tantum et verba, tanquam panem et vinum, data.' In the article following—'Quod formam et vim venerandæ et vivificæ crucis non solum non agnoscant, sed infinitis etiam contumeliis onerent.' The six articles thus stated by Petrus Siculus are given by Photius in the same order, and with no very important alteration or addition: only, the patriarch increases the list by the charge of the most abandoned obscenity and profligacy.

§ The Sicilian elsewhere admits that the Paulicians professed the principal Catholic doctrines; but *aliter ore, aliter corde*. These mental heresies, so gratuitously imputed where every outward proof is wanting, are the most wicked invention of ecclesiastical rancour.

We are, of course, bound to receive these articles with suspicion, as the allegations of an enemy. Still they had, unquestionably, some foundation. The first and fifth are sufficient to prove that the Paulicians maintained some opinions resembling those of Manes. It seems, indeed, most probable that they were descended from some one of the antient Gnostic sects, which, though diversified in many particulars, all professed one common characteristic. Again, whether or not they believed the eternity of matter is questionable; but it was seemingly their opinion that matter was the seat and source of all evil; and that, when endued with life and motion, it had produced an active principle, which was the cause of vice and misery. Respecting the third charge, it appears that, in their passion for the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, they attached merely a figurative sense to the bread and wine administered by Christ at the last supper, understanding thereby a spiritual food and nourishment for the soul. The second and fourth evince their freedom from some of the popular superstitions of the Greeks—adoration of the Virgin, and reverence for the fancied relics of the Cross; and this, again, had alone been crime sufficient to arm against them, in the eighth and ninth centuries, the intemperate zealots of the Oriental Church. Add to this, that they held the images of the Saints in no reverence, and recommended to every class of the people the assiduous study of the sacred volume; not suppressing their indignation against the Greeks, who closed the sources of divine knowledge against all, except the priests*. . . These various subjects of difference duly considered, we shall not wonder that the Paulicians became the victims of the most deadly persecution which ever disgraced the Eastern Church. And since they were, in some manner, the reformers of their time, and as their zeal was indiscriminately directed as well against the sacerdotal order as against the corruptions introduced or supported by it, the Schismatics of Armenia resembled, both in their principles and their excesses, the Bohemians of the fifteenth age. The resemblance was increased by the violent means which were in both cases adopted to crush them, and which were resisted with the same ferocious heroism by both. Nor were their concluding destinies very different; for, though the sect of the Paulicians was at length expatriated, and finally extinguished or forgotten in the Bulgarian deserts, the Christians of Armenia never afterwards returned with any fidelity to the communion from which they had been so violently dissevered.

Amidst the metaphysical disputes which agitated the Greeks in the sixth and seventh centuries, that strong disposition to mysticism, which is peculiarly congenial with the oriental *Mysticism prevalent in the East.* character, gave frequent proofs of its activity, though it never became the predominant spirit. It was princi-

* A considerable proportion of the work of Petrus Siculus is consumed in describing the process, by which the mind of Sergius or Constantine, the founder of the sect, was corrupted by the seductions of a Manichæan woman. The following is an important specimen of the dialogue (page 761): 'Audio, Domine Sergi, te literarum scientia et eruditione præstantem esse, et bonum præterea virum usquequaque. Dic ergo mihi, cur non legis sacra Evangelia? Quibus ille ita respondit. Nobis profanis ista legere non licet, sed sacerdotibus duntaxat. At illa—Non est ita ut putas; nec enim personarum acceptio est apud Deum. Omnes siquidem homines vult salvos fieri Dominus et ad agnitionem veritatis venire. At sacerdotes vestri, quoniam Dei verbum adulterant et mysteria occultant, quæ in Evangeliiis continentur, idcirco, vobis audientibus omnia non legunt quæ scripta sunt,' &c. It is related that Constantine received from a deacon, in return for some acts of hospitality, the present of the New Testament. Thus it appears that, before the middle of the seventh century, the Eastern clergy had effectually shut up the sources of sacred knowledge.

pally cherished in the monastic establishments; and when free from the strange notions into which it not uncommonly seduced irregular minds, it gave birth; without any doubt, to much genuine and ardent piety. But in the course of ecclesiastical history, through a painful necessity perpetually imposed upon its writer, it is by the excesses of piety rather than its natural and ordinary fruits, by the abuses of religion rather than its daily and individual uses and blessings, that attention is fixed and curiosity excited. In the civil and political records of nations the exploits of patriotism and the deeds which throw dignity on human nature, are proclaimed and celebrated, because they were performed in the public fields of renown, with kings and nations for their witnesses. But in a religious society the purest characters are commonly those, which shun celebrity and court oblivion. The noblest patriots in the kingdom of Christ are men who serve their Heavenly Master in holiness and in peace. They have their eternal recompense; but it is rare that they rise into worldly notice, or throw their modest lustre on the historic page.

On this account it is, that, while the absurdities of mysticism are commonly known and derided, the good effect which it has had, in turning the mind to spiritual resolves and amending the heart of multitudes imbued with it, is generally overlooked. We cannot now recall the names, or publish the pious acts or aspirations, which have been concealed or forgotten; yet may we approach, in a spirit of benevolence, the follies which have been so carefully recorded; and while we pursue with unsparing denunciation the crimes of ecclesiastical hypocrites—the ambition, the frauds, the avarice, the bigotry of a secular hierarchy—we may pass with haste and compassion over the errors and extravagances of piety.

Mosheim* ascribes the introduction of the mystical theology into the Western Church to a copy of the pretended works of Dionysius the Areopagite, sent by the Emperor Michael Balbus to Lewis the Meek. Whether this be true or not, it was certainly in the East that those opinions were most prevalent, not in earlier only, but also in later ages. It is particularly recorded, that, in the twelfth century, numerous fanatics disturbed the unity and repose of the Oriental Church by errors proceeding from those principles. It is said that they rejected every form of external worship, all the ceremonies, and even the sacraments of the Church; that they placed the whole essence of religion in internal prayer; and maintained that in the breast of every mortal an evil genius presided, against which no force nor expedient was availing, except unremitted prayer and supplication. One Lycopetrus is believed to have founded this sect, and

Euchites or Messalians.

to have been succeeded by a disciple named Tychicus; and their followers were presently known throughout the East by the denomination of Euchites, or Messalians†, *Men of Prayer*. The term was considered ignominious; and it presently came generally into use to designate all who were adverse to the persons of the clergy, or the system of the Church. The Churchmen of the West were at the same period beginning to employ the terms Waldenses and Albigenses with the same latitude and for the same purpose; and as, in the one instance, we are well assured that many holy individuals were involved in the indiscriminate scandal, so also may the

* Cent. ix. p. 2, chap. iii. The works of Dionysius, though long received as genuine, are a palpable forgery, probably of the fifth century.

† This was, in fact, only the revival of an ancient heresy, condemned, under the same name and probably for the same errors, by the Council of Antioch, held towards the end of the fourth age. See Fleury, l. xix. s. 25, 26, and l. xcv. s. 9.

seeds of a purer worship have lurked in the barren bosom of the Messalian heresy.

Two centuries afterwards, the eye of Barlaam, an inquisitive ecclesiastic, sharpened by much intercourse with the hierarchy of the West, detected, in the monasteries of Mount Athos, a *Hesychasts*, or very singular form of fanaticism. A sect of persons was *Quietists*, there discovered, who believed that, through a process of intense contemplation, they had attained the condition of perfect and heavenly repose. The method of their contemplation is conveyed in the following instructions, handed down to them, as it would seem, from the eleventh century* :—‘ Being alone in thy cell, close the door, and seat thyself in the corner. Raise thy spirit above all vain and transient things; repose thy beard on thy breast, and turn thine eyes with thy whole power of meditation upon thy navel. Retain thy breath, and search in thine entrails for the place of thy heart, wherein all the powers of the soul reside. At first thou wilt encounter thick darkness; but by persevering night and day thou wilt find a marvellous and uninterrupted joy; for as soon as thy spirit shall have discovered the place of thy heart, it will perceive itself *luminous* and full of discernment.’ When interrogated respecting the nature of this light, they replied that it was the *glory of God*; the same which surrounded Christ during the transfiguration. These enthusiasts were originally called *Hesychasts*, or, in Latin, *Quietists*; they afterwards obtained the name of *Ομφαλόψυχοι*, or *Umbilicani*, ‘men whose souls are in their navels.’ They were also known by that of *Thaborites*, from their belief respecting the nature of their divine light.

It might seem beneath the dignity of history to waste a thought or a sigh on such pure fanaticism. Yet such was it not considered in the age in which it rose; but it occupied, on the contrary, the solemn consideration of courts and councils. Barlaam officiously denounced the heresy to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Metropolitan was astounded, and instantly summoned the *Hesychasts* into his presence. As they argued with confidence, a Council was thought necessary to decide so grave a controversy; but the Emperor Andronicus hesitated to convoke it, and strongly recommended to both parties silence and reconciliation. However, the polemics persisted; the Emperor yielded; and the Council was assembled†. The Archbishop of Thessalonica, Gregory Palamas, advocated the cause of the *Thaborites*; and, what might astonish even those most familiar with the triumphs of religious extravagance, he succeeded. Nay, so signal was his success, that the accuser thought it expedient to retire from the country and return to Italy. . . . The controversy was soon afterwards renewed, and became the occasion of other councils, which agreed without exception in the condemnation of the *Barlaamites*. But the question had now assumed a more general form;—the *Quietism* of the Monks of Mount Athos was no longer the subject of dispute; it ascended to the mysterious inquiry, whether the eternal light with which God was encircled, which might be called his *energy* or operation, and which was manifested to the disciples on Mount Thabor, was distinct from his *nature* and essence, or identified with it‡? The former was the opinion of the pious Archbishop Palamas. It grew gradually to be considered as the

* It is found in a spiritual treatise of Simon, abbot of the monastery of Xerocerca, at Constantinople, and is cited by Fleury, l. xcv. s. 9.

† It was held on June 11, 1341, and the Emperor presided in person, together with the Patriarch and many of the nobility of the empire.

‡ See Mosheim. Cent. xiv. p. 2, ch. v.

more reasonable tenet,' and finally took its place, after a series of solemn deliberations, among the dogmas of the Oriental Church.

We must notice one or two other disputes, of greater notoriety than importance, which occasioned some transient agitation in the East. A monk named Basilus was burnt in the Hippodrome during the reign of Alexius Comnenus for opinions which he refused, on repeated solicitation, to renounce*. They are known to us only from his enemies. He is said to have maintained that the world and all its inhabitants were the creation of an evil and degraded demon, so that the body was no better than the prison house of the immortal spirit; wherefore, it became man to enervate and subject it by fasting, prayer, and contemplation, and thereby to redeem the soul from its degrading captivity. This Heresiarch had many followers, who were called Bogomiles—as it is said, from a Mysian word signifying 'the invocation of divine mercy.' These sectarians also denied, with the Phantastics, the reality of the body of Christ; while, with the Gnostics, they rejected the law of Moses. Upon the whole, it would seem that their creed was formed by an infusion of mysticism into the leading Paulician tenets—a combination which it was natural to expect in an age, when the latter were still in some repute, and in a Church, wherein the former never wholly lost its influence†.

About the same time, the same Alexius Comnenus was compelled to apply to the exigencies of the state some of the figures which adorned the churches. Leo, Bishop of Chalcedon, loudly exclaimed against the sacrilege, asserting that the images were endued with some portion of *inherent sanctity*. The monks re-echoed the charge, and a council was in consequence assembled at Constantinople. It decided that images had only a relative worship (σχετικῶς προσκυνούμεν οὐ λατρευτικῶς τὰς εἰκόνας); and that it was offered not to the substance of the matter, but to the form and features, of which they bear the impression; that the representatives of Christ, whether in painting or sculpture, did not partake of the nature of Christ, though enriched by a certain communication of divine grace; and lastly, that invocations were to be addressed to the saints only as servants of Christ in their relation to their master. This moderate exposition of the doctrine did not, however, satisfy the Bishops, who persisted in their lofty notions, until the secular authority interposed to repress them‡.

The curious learning of Manuel Comnenus gave birth, in the twelfth century, to several frivolous disputes. There is, however, one which deserves some notice, as well from the singularity of its subject as from the spirit in which it was conducted and concluded. The catechisms of the Greek Church contained a standing anathema against the God of Mahomet. Through the imperfect comprehension of an Arabic word, the Greeks represented that Being as *solid* and *spherical*§, and consequently

* 'Ο δὲ πρὸς ἀπασαν τιμωρίαν καὶ ἀπειλὴν καταφρονετικῶς κατεφάνητο. οὗτι γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸ κατημέλλετο τὴν σὸς αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν, οὗτι αἱ τοῦ Αυτοκράτορος πρὸς αὐτὸν διαπομπαὶ διαμνήσεις κατ'εἰρήνην. The people demanded the execution of all his followers, but the Emperor was contented with a single victim. See the Alexiad. book xx.

† Anna Comnena's expression is, τὸ τῶν Βογομίλων δόγμα, ἢ Μασσαλιανῶν καὶ Μανιχαίων συγκείμενον. That orthodox princess vituperates in very strong language the persons, the practices, and the opinions of the Bogomiles, and relates how the heresiarch was one night stoned by demons while reposing in his cell. She also particularizes an error respecting the Eucharist; but is not otherwise very specific in her charges.

‡ Mosh., c. xi., p. 2, ch. iii.

§ Ὀλόφαιρος. The Arabic word, which bears that signification, also signifies *eternal*.

not an object of spiritual adoration. As this anathema tended to add irritation to the subsisting animosity, and offended especially such Mahometans as had embraced, or were disposed to embrace, the Christian faith, the Emperor ordered it to be erased from the public ritual. The doctors and dignitaries were scandalized at the rashness of the innovation; they entered eagerly into the most abstruse inquiries respecting the nature of the Deity; they condemned the imperial decree, and the purple itself was an insufficient shelter against the imputation of heresy*. But an imperial heretic will never be destitute of supporters; and the contest was carried on with the accustomed vehemence and rancour. In this, as in most other controversies, a moderate party interposed and proffered a project of conciliation; but in this, unlike the usual fortune of theological conflicts, the moderate party prevailed. A council was assembled; and, after an angry and protracted struggle, the Bishops at length consented to the following compromise:—'That the anathema should keep its place in the ritual, but that its object should be changed from the God of Mahomet to Mahomet himself.' On these conditions the fathers retired, authorized to denounce the impostor, but compelled to spare the Deity.

In resuming, after so long an interval, the history of the Oriental Church, it becomes necessary to recur to some of the leading principles of its constitution, and to notice the material feature by which it was early distinguished, as it is still distinguished, from its Roman rival. *Essential distinctions between the two Churches.*

And as we have before traced the connexion of those communions until the beginning of the schism, and as we now propose shortly to describe the principal attempts which were made to reunite them, it is proper to observe the different ground on which they stood, that we may truly estimate the difficulty of those attempts; for, though the matters of doctrinal dispute may be reduced to a few articles, and though the differences on discipline and government might seem to be virtually absorbed in one—the supremacy of the Pope—nevertheless, the numerous diversities which subsisted in all the principles, as well as the economy, of the two establishments, threw impediments in the way of reconciliation, which, though not always in sight, were ever in active operation.

In the first place, we may mention the firm, uninterrupted maintenance of the imperial supremacy. While the pontiffs of the West were first securing their emancipation, and then asserting their pre-eminence over every secular authority, the Greek ecclesiasties were the subjects of the civil magistrate; they were translated, deposed, or even executed, at his undisputed control; and whatever wealth or influence they may have obtained, they were never able to withdraw themselves from the temporal yoke, nor to establish, like their Latin brethren, a distinct and independent republic. Hence it results that the individuals who composed the higher order of the clergy, were essentially different in the two communions; different in their personal habits, in their private views, in their public estimation of the sacerdotal character, and the true polity of the Church.

* Hildebrand himself, in an earlier age, had made himself liable to the same imputation. In a letter to the King of Morocco, expressing thanks for the liberation of some Christian captives, he expressed his conviction that the King had been moved thereto by the spirit of God; and that both he and the infidel worshipped the same God, though the modes of their adoration and faith were different. This is mentioned by Mills in his History of the Crusades.

† See Gibbon, chap. liii

How much more widely was this distinction extended by the absence in the East of all feudal institutions, and of the character which they so deeply impressed upon every order, and almost every individual, living under them! That patrimonial jurisdiction by which public justice became private property; the secular pomp and appendages of baronial state; and, above all, the practice of military achievement, were circumstances unknown to the hierarchy of the East. They viewed with astonishment the temporal greatness of the apostolical successors; they condemned it with justice and seeming sincerity; and the envy, which may have mingled with that condemnation, rendered it the more severe and malevolent.

Notwithstanding the literary degeneracy and languor of the Greeks, their superstitious reverence for the ancient models, the servility with which they copied without daring to emulate—though it be true that ‘in the revolution of ten centuries not a single discovery was made to exalt the dignity or promote the happiness of mankind, not a single idea added to the speculative systems of antiquity’—yet was it something in those barren ages, to admire, to copy, to praise, even to possess the noblest monuments of human genius. And, though they lay fruitless in the hands of their possessors, and unproductive of any original effort or bold imitation, yet were they not without effect in diffusing light and information, and in raising the people, by which they were cultivated however imperfectly, far above the prostrate barbarism of the West*. Nor was it only that the education of the clergy embraced more subjects of useful instruction, but also, that education was not wholly confined to the clergy, but extended generally to the higher classes in society. It was the same with theological as with profane literature. It was an object of very general interest and inquiry; and the industry to pursue it was kept alive among a disputatious race, by the occasional appearance of domestic heresy, and by the long-protracted controversies with the rival Church. A superiority in literary discrimination will account for the circumstance that the forgery called the ‘false decretals’ was at once rejected by the Eastern Church. There were, indeed, other sufficient reasons to prevent a code, which conferred supremacy almost unlimited on the Roman Bishop, from being acknowledged either by the Court or the Church of Constantinople: but it is also probable that the penetration of the Greeks at once detected the clumsy imposture.

The mention of the Decretals recalls the consideration of the Papal polity, founded in a great measure upon them. We have observed, that, after their promulgation, a system of government and a form of discipline unknown to earlier ages grew up, and continued, as it grew, to deviate farther and farther from the original canons and practices. We have traced the gradual usurpations of the See of Rome, and the changes introduced by pontifical ambition into the very heart and vitals of the Ca-

* The eleventh age, for instance, produced, besides Alexius Comnenus, and others of less renown, Cerularius, Cedrenus, and the illustrator of Aristotle, Michel Psellus. Among the literary names of the twelfth (and thirty-six are enumerated by Dupin as *commendables* for their knowledge of theology, canon law, and history) are Cinnamus, Glycas, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Dionysius the geographer, and the celebrated commentator Eustathius, Bishop of Thessalonica. The industry of the Greeks seems ever to be most keenly excited by controversy; and this age was enlivened, not only by some warm disputes with the Latins, but also by a contest between the systems of Plato and Aristotle. During the greater part of the thirteenth age the Latins were in possession of Constantinople; but in the fourteenth, the names of Nicephorus Gregoras, Manuel Chrysoloras, Nicephorus Callistus, are boasted by the Greeks; and the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, and other scholastic writers, were translated and studied. Yet Plato had still his followers.

tholic Church. That powerful agency had no existence in the East; before it began to operate with any great success, the separation of the Churches was so decidedly pronounced, and their animosity so strongly marked, that the introduction of a change into the one would have been reason almost sufficient for rejecting it in the other.

It was not, indeed, that the Patriarchs of Constantinople were exempt from the ruling passion of their Roman brethren, nor that they failed to profit by any favourable occasion to extend their authority and curtail the independence of their clergy. But such occasions were rare, because they could only arise through the co-operation or connivance of the civil authorities; and what the caprice of one despot had bestowed, might be as easily taken away by the opposite caprice of another. In the mean time, there was one steady and unvarying principle, on which the ecclesiastical policy of the East was conducted—an inviolable reverence for antiquity. It was by this standard that the excellence of every institution was measured. The canons of the Seven General Councils, the precepts of the early fathers, the practice of the primitive Church—these were the unalterable rules and models for the guidance and government of the Church. It was not so with the worldly hierarchy of Rome. They presently learned to subject antiquity to the more flexible laws of expediency. When it countenanced the purpose of the moment, they bowed to its venerable name. But whenever its voice was unequivocally raised in opposition to their schemes, then was it readily discovered, that all truth and excellence were *not* communicated in the beginning; but that something was reserved for more seasonable revelation, or mere human discovery. On the other hand, the Greeks were the *bigots* of antiquity; their worship was blind, and therefore both consistent and passionate. Hence it happened, that the least important among the modern opinions or practices* of their rivals disgusted them at least as deeply as the most essential; and that, while they rejected the change, they detested the innovator. They were as intolerant in their feelings towards the Latins, as were the Latins towards their own heretics; and so general were those feelings and so carefully nourished by the clergy, and so continually rekindled by the continuance of schism and controversy, that if a sincere reconciliation, founded on compromise, could possibly have been effected by the directors of the two Churches, it was scarcely probable that it would be accepted by the inferior clergy and people of Greece.

The foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem at the end of the eleventh century gave to the Latins a substantial footing in the East, and seemed to open the gates of concord. In a *Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*. close alliance against the common enemy of the Christian name, there was hope that the less perceptible differences among Christians would altogether vanish and be forgotten. The harmony of so many sects and tongues united in adoration of the same Saviour, at his birth-place and round his tomb, might have afforded a spectacle of charity and a prospect of peace. If any circumstance of place or association, any reverence of sacred monuments, any brotherhood in holy enterprise, could have quenched the fire of sectarian animosities, we might have expected that blessing from the occupation of Palestine and the redemption of the Sepulchre of Christ. . . . What was really the result? The very circumstances, which should have produced religious

* The Latin practice of Tonsure (*κρίσιμα*) may be particularly mentioned, as exciting the indignation and disdain of a bearded priesthood.

unanimity, seem to have had no other effect than to multiply the causes of discord, to exasperate its nature, and to aggravate its shame.

The first act of the conquerors was to establish, throughout the narrow extent of their new kingdom, a numerous body of Latin clergy. A Latin Patriarch was appointed at Jerusalem, a second at Antioch; and episcopal sees were multiplied under the jurisdiction of both. Of the native population, those who followed the Christian faith were indissolubly attached to a different rite, and the authority of the Latin Prelates was confined to a precarious host of crusaders and colonists. Nevertheless, their first care was to place on a solid foundation the temporalities of their Churches*; and since the feudal institutions were those on which the civil government of Godfrey was formed, so the bishops sought to attach to their sees cities, and fortresses, and baronies, according to the preposterous practice of the West. Then arose the customary dissensions between the spiritual and secular authorities, on the extent of their prerogatives and the limits of their jurisdiction: and they were inflamed in Palestine, even beyond their usual violence, by the peculiar position and character of the Military Orders; for these were endowed with various privileges by the Roman See, and were not disposed to concede them. Thence proceeded perpetual appeals to Rome, with all their train of pernicious consequences; legates *a latere* were profusely poured into the Holy City; and by their ignorance, their obstinacy, their arrogance, and their avarice, precipitated the downfall of the kingdom.

It was dissolved after the battle of Tiberias in 1187; and whatsoever contempt of their Latin brethren the clergy of the East may have previously and perhaps ignorantly entertained, it was not diminished by the nearer inspection of their character, which was afforded by the conquest of Palestine. Thus it proved, that the advances towards conciliation, which were made during this century by the Emperors of the Comnenus family, led to no good result. Negotiations were opened; but the demands of the Vatican were positive, and they amounted to nothing less than spiritual submission. Perhaps the Emperors, who had discovered the secret of their own political weakness, and began to tremble at the temporal influence of the Vatican, might have consented even to that condition. But the Prelates of the East, who were swayed by different views and interests, indignantly rejected it; and the failure of the attempt only increased the asperity of both parties.

The reign of the Latins in Palestine was concluded in less than ninety years; their dominion in Constantinople had a still shorter duration: yet its effects on the ecclesiastical relations of the East and the West were more direct and permanent, without being in any respect more beneficial. The capital of the East was stormed by the crusaders in the year 1204. Innocent III. was at that time Pope; and in the first instance he strongly reprobated the treacherous achievement: but the conquerors were acquainted with a sure expedient to soften his displeasure. Already did

* See Fleury's Sixth Discourse on Ecclesiastical History. 'According to the spirit of the Gospel (says that writer) the Latin clergy should have attended principally to the instruction and correction of the crusaders; to form, as it were, a new Christianity, approaching as nearly as possible to the purity of the early ages, and capable of attracting, by its good example, the surrounding infidels. Next they should have engaged in the reconciliation of heretics and schismatics, and the conversion of the infidels themselves: it was the only method of making the crusade useful. But our Latin clergy was not sufficiently well-informed to have views so pure and exalted—as it was on this side of the sea, such was it in Palestine, or even more ignorant and more corrupted. . . .'

Alexis, when raised to the purple which he so soon forfeited, greet the Pontiff with promises of spiritual obedience for himself and for his Church; and Innocent, in rejoinder, gave him divine assurance of prosperity should he observe his faith*, and of speedy reverse should he violate it. It was also one of the first acts of the Latin conquerors to tender the same submission to the Pontiff, to proffer the same promises, and likewise to solicit, with all humility, his confirmation of the conquest. Innocent professed some embarrassment at this application; the perversion of the legitimate object of the crusaders was too scandalous—their excesses in the spoliation of the city too notorious—their motives too obvious—the offence too recent. Accordingly the Pontiff expressed his disapprobation both of the enterprise itself and the circumstances attending it; and particularly condemned that sacrilegious violence which had exasperated the Greeks, and turned them away from ‘obedience to the Apostolic See.’ Nevertheless, since the deed was perpetrated, he thought it expedient, after mature deliberation, not only with his cardinals, but with all his influential clergy, not to withhold from it his sanction—because, forsooth, the designs of Providence were inscrutable; and it might be, that, in chastising the long-endured iniquities of the Greeks, a just God had employed the arms of the Latins as the instruments of a holy regeneration†.

In the year following, the Pope applied himself more directly to reap the fruits of this unprincipled adventure. He excited the zeal of all the faithful for the defence of the new empire. He wrote a circular letter to the leading prelates of France, exhorting them to preach the indulgence for its defence, and at the same time observing, that Providence had transferred the sceptre from the proud, superstitious, and rebellious Greeks, to the humble Catholic and obedient Latins, to the end that his holy Church might be consoled by the reunion of the schismatics.

In the mean time not a moment was lost in establishing the Latin Communion at Constantinople; in introducing the Latin Liturgy; in encouraging eminent ecclesiastics to emigrate to the East, and firmly to plant in the churches and schools of Constantinople the doctrines, the discipline, the polity, and the learning of the West. That the nature of that encouragement was not wholly spiritual—that an establishment founded by Innocent III. held out no inconsiderable temporal allurements§—is a circumstance which will excite no surprise in us; though it did not, perhaps, increase the respect or affection of the Greeks towards their new instructors. A concordat was signed in 1206 by the Latin Patriarch on

*Establishment of
the Latin Church.*

* The express condition prescribed by Innocent to Alexis was, that he should engage the Patriarch to send a solemn deputation to Rome, for the purpose of recognizing the supremacy of the Roman Church, promising obedience to the Pope, and soliciting the *Pallium*, as necessary for the lawful exercise of his patriarchal functions.

† ‘Ut jam merito Latinos abhorreant plus quam canes,’ Epistle to the Marquis of Montserrat.

‡ See the Epistle of Innocent to the Marquis of Montserrat, published by Raynaldus, ad ann. 1205. ‘Divinum enim videtur fuisse judicium, ut qui tamdiu misericorditer tolerati, et toties non solum ab aliis sed etiam a nobis studiosè commoniti noluerunt redire ad Ecclesiæ universitatem, nec ullum terræ sanctæ subsidium impertiri, per eos, qui ad utrumque pariter intendebant, omitterent locum et gentem, quatenus *perditis malis terra bona bonis* Agricolis locaretur, qui fructum reddant tempore opportuno, &c.’

§ The following are the Pope’s expressions, addressed to the Archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans:—‘Exhortamur, quatenus tam clericos quam laicos efficaciter inducatís ut ad *capessendas spirituales pariter et temporales divitias* ad præfatum Imperatorem accedant, qui singulos vult et potest, secundum status suos, &c. *quere divitiis et honoribus* ampliare, &c.’

the one hand, and the regent, barons, knights, and people on the other, by which a fifteenth portion of all domains without the walls, of all cities, castles, villages; of corn-fields, vineyards, forests, meadows and other immoveables, was at once bestowed upon the Latin Church. At the same time, all the monasteries, even within the walls, appear to have been transferred to the ascendant establishment*. By another article it was regulated, that tithe should also be paid by all Latins—and 'if (it was added) in process of time it should be found practicable to persuade the Greeks also to contribute their tithe, the laity shall offer them no impediment.' We should here recollect, that this method of remunerating the clergy, so long familiar to the people of the West, had never been sanctioned by any law, or grown into any general use, in the Oriental Church.

If one of the earliest exhibitions presented by the Roman Catholic clergy to the schismatics of the East was that of their *Dissensions*. avarice; another as early, as violent, and almost as revolting, was that of their dissension. Before the storming of the city by the French and Venetians, a sort of convention had been made between those two nations, to this effect—that, if the empire should be vested in a Frenchman, the Church should be under Venetian superintendence. Accordingly the first patriarch, Thomas Morosini, was a native of Venice; and he immediately took measures so to fill the chapter of the Patriarchal Cathedral, as to secure a compatriot for his successor. Innocent vehemently remonstrated against this design. He sent his legates to Constantinople; and as they acted in opposition to the resident head of the Church, the schismatics were edified by witnessing the jealous disputes of two independent authorities. But it was on the death of Morosini (in 1211) that the struggle really commenced. The Venetian Canons entered the Church of St. Sophia, with arms in their hands, and proceeded to the choice of a Venetian successor. Other ecclesiastics of other nations, who also claimed their share in the election, nominated three other candidates, and the matter was referred to Rome. The Pope commanded them to meet and deliberate in common, and the result was a second disagreement. The dispute was conducted with the customary violence; and as it lasted for about three years, during which space the highest office in the Church remained vacant, it furnished the schismatic spectators with another equivocal proof of the superior excellence of the Roman polity. In the mean time the sectarian antipathy continued to be so strongly manifested on their part, that there were many of their clergy who, before they celebrated the Communion, caused those altars to be washed, which had been polluted by the ceremony of the Latins; and who likewise insisted on re-baptizing all who had received that sacrament from Latin hands. These proofs of insubordination are mentioned with censure in one of the canons of the Fourth Lateran Church.

While the Roman hierarchy was endeavouring to fix and extend its conquest along the western shores of the Bosphorus, the genuine pastors of the oriental Church, the legitimate guardians of its apostolical purity, were assembled in honourable exile at Nice. They had witnessed the shame, the pillage, and the desolation of the metropolis of their faith; they had seen their churches despoiled, and their altars violated; the holy images trampled under foot, the relics of departed saints scattered in

* It should be mentioned that the French and Venetians had entered into a convention, by which, after making a decent provision for the Oriental clergy, they proposed to divide between themselves the rest of the Church property. But Innocent took under his own protection the property even of a rival Church, and immediately annulled the convention.

the dust, the sacred utensils desecrated, and the sanctuary of St. Sophia profaned and plundered by lawless and *Latin* hands. Such assuredly was not the season for any dreams of reconciliation. But after the lapse of one generation, when these bitter recollections were not quite so recent, an accident occurred which opened the way to a serious negotiation between the churches—if we should not rather say, the courts—of Nice and Rome. Five Franciscan missionaries, in the discharge of their perilous duties among the infidels, were seized by the Turks, and on their liberation, dismissed to Nice. They were humanely received by the patriarch Germanus, who was edified by their poverty and their zeal; and, in the communications of a friendly intercourse, the division of the two churches was mentioned and deplored by both parties. The emperor (John Vataces) had strong political reasons for desiring an accommodation; and with his consent the patriarch addressed some amicable overtures, though not unmixed with untimely reproach*, both to the Pope and the cardinals.

This took place in 1232, during the reign of Gregory IX.; and in the year following the Pontiff sent four mendicants, (two Dominicans, and two Franciscans) to conduct the *Latin Mission negotiations* in the east. They presented themselves at *to Nice.* Nice before the emperor and the patriarch, in the January of 1234; and a series of conferences then commenced, which did not finally terminate, though occasionally interrupted, till the middle of May. It were needless to unfold the particulars of this controversy, though they are not destitute of interest and instruction to the theological reader; nor shall we pursue the intricate manœuvres of the disputants, though the most practised polemic might possibly peruse them with profit. It is sufficient to mention, that the dispute turned entirely on two points, the procession of the Holy Spirit; and the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. The Greeks urged the ancient doctrine and practice; the Latins, without conceding their claims to the authority of early writers, rested the weight of their defence on scripture. The debates were broken off, and renewed; the same arguments and assertions were repelled and reiterated; and the ardour of the opposition increased, as the contest was prolonged.

At length the emperor, who was less heated by the theological zeal, and more sincere, as he was more interested, in his desire for reconciliation, personally proposed to the envoys a compromise. As in political,

* 'To go to the bottom of the question (said the patriarch) many powerful and noble persons would obey you, if they did not fear your oppression, and the wanton extortions and undue services which you exact from your subjects. Hence proceed cruel wars, the depopulation of cities, the closing of the churches, the cessation of the divine offices, every thing short of martyrdom, and some things not far short of that. For there is now imminent danger that the tyrannical tribunal will be unclosed, and torments and bloodshed, and the crown of martyrdom proposed to us. Is this the lesson which St. Peter teaches, when he instructs the shepherd to conduct his flock without constraint or domination?' In his letter to the cardinals he wrote with equal bitterness. 'Permit me to speak the truth to you. Our division has arisen from the tyrannical oppression which you exercise, and the exactions of the Roman Church, which, from being a mother, has become a step-mother, and tramples upon others in proportion as they humble themselves before her. We are scandalized to see you exclusively attached to the good things of this world; heaping up from all quarters gold and silver, and making kingdoms your tributaries.' That such reproaches, however just, should have broken forth in letters expressly conciliatory, might well have led those, to whom they were addressed, to despair of the success of the negotiation. The original epistles are given by Matthew Paris, *Hist. Major. ann. 1237*; whose remark it is that the animosity of the Greek Church was occasioned by the acts, more than the opinions, of its rival. See also Raynaldus, *ann. 1232-3*.

(said this simple mediator) so be it in theological negotiations. When princes differ respecting a city or a province, each party relaxes somewhat of his pretensions for the attainment of peace. Our differences in this matter are two*, and if you sincerely wish for concord, concede one of them. We will approve and revere your holy sacrament; abandon to us your creed; say the creed as we say it, effacing the offensive addition. They replied—Let us tell you that the Pope and the Roman Church will not abandon one iota of its faith, or of any thing contained in its creed. But the following proposal we may consent to make to you. You must firmly believe and teach others, that the body of our Lord may be consecrated with unleavened *as well as* leavened bread; and you must burn all the books which your churchmen have written to the contrary. And in respect to the Holy Spirit, you must believe that it proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, and teach the people so; but the Pope will not oblige you to insert the article in your creed—only all books which have been written against it shall be burnt. . . On hearing this final declaration, the emperor resigned himself to despair†; but in his prelates it excited only feelings of indignation and revenge. One other violent conference followed, to which large multitudes of the people were admitted; and it was broken off by mutual charges of heresy, and confirmations of the ancient anathema. The legates then withdrew; having increased the evils which they had proposed to remove, and added fresh fuel and fierceness to the controversy.

The failure of this enterprise did not prevent a similar attempt on the part of Innocent IV., which was conducted with more moderation, but with no better success, than the former. The agent, selected for the conduct of this mission, was of great dignity and reputation in the Church. John of Parma, general of the Franciscan order, and alike eminent for his theological erudition, and the austerity of his life, was a character well calculated to influence the prelates of the East. It is something to be enabled to assert that his sojourn at Nice (in 1249) produced no mischief; but the negotiations, which seemed likely to result from it, were prevented by the death of the Pope and the Emperor. In 1261, the sceptre of the Latins was broken; and, upon the whole, we are unable to observe that their conquest had any spiritual fruits, or any other consequences than bitterness and aggravated rancour‡. And we may here remark, that as the Latins on their expulsion from the East did not resign their claims to ecclesiastical ascendancy, or abolish the titles of the dignities there con-

* We should observe, that throughout this dispute, it was always assumed by the Latins, that the result, or rather that the meaning, of the reconciliation would be the *obedience* of the Greek to the Roman Church; a return to that (supposed) submission which the former had shaken off. Now this assumption was not (as far as we can see) contested by the Greeks, certainly it was not made matter of argument. And yet that establishment of *supremacy* was, in fact, the point at which the Roman was ultimately aiming—as it was also that to which his pretensions were most slightly founded.

† 'De corpore Christi ita dicimus—quod oportebit vos firmiter credere et aliis prædicare quod Corpus Christi confici potest ita in Azymis sicut in fermentato; et omnes libri, quos vestri scripserunt contra Fidem, condemnentur et comburantur. De S. Sancto ita dicimus; quod oportebit vos credere S.S. procedere a Filio sicut a Patre, et istud necesse, ut prædicetur in populo; quod autem cantetis istud in Symbolo, nisi velitis, non compellet vos Dominus Papa; condemnatis et combustis omnibus libris, qui huic capitulo sunt contrarii. Quod audiens imperator graviter tulit, &c.' The envoys wrote an account of their own embassy, addressed to the Pope, and contained in *Libro Censuum*; whence Raynaldus (ann. 1232) has made extracts.

‡ Fleury goes so far as to consider the schism, properly speaking, to have commenced only at this period. Such, however, was not the opinion of people in those days; in the account of the previous negotiations at Nice, we observe, that the emperor, on some

ferred upon their own clergy, so there continued long to exist about the Roman court titular patriarchs, and titular bishops, of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem and other oriental sees, who, by the assumption of those empty names, offended the sensitive vanity of the Greeks, and kept alive the mutual irritation.

Howbeit, for a short period after the restoration, the reunion was negotiated with much more ardour than at any former time, and even with a momentary show of success. *Subsequent attempts at re-union.* The reason of this eagerness on the part of Palæologus was the consciousness of his weakness, and the terror of another crusade against his still unsettled government. 'I speak not now,' he said, 'about dogmas or ceremonies of religion. If there is any difference on that subject, we can arrange it more easily, after peace shall have been concluded between us.' The union desired by the emperor was external and political: a perfect theological concord he might think hopeless, or he might not comprehend its importance. Some Franciscans were once more sent to the East by Urban IV.; and some articles were hastily drawn up. But Clement IV. refused them his ratification, and composed a more accurate formulary of faith, which he proposed for the acceptance of the Greeks. This confession contained not only the disputed tenet of the Holy Procession, but also expressed, with great precision, the doctrine of purgatory, and specified the condition of souls after death, according to the degrees of their impurity. Also, the doctrine and name of transubstantiation were marked in it very particularly. Moreover, the plenitude of pontifical power, and the duty of universal appeal to that tribunal were carefully inculcated. Clement could scarcely have expected so much acquiescence from the *clergy* of the East; but in a subsequent letter to the emperor he failed not to remind him, that the crown possessed power sufficient, and even more than sufficient, to control the inclinations both of the clergy and the people.

In the earlier part of these negotiations, the clergy had preserved the appearance of neutrality; because they were unwilling, without great necessity, to oppose any project of the emperor, and because they considered his present project as wholly impracticable. Probably they did not suppose that he was himself sincere in so desperate a scheme. Nevertheless, as his political difficulties increased, he became more earnest in his design; and when some of his prelates were at length alarmed into resistance, he employed the secular authority to repress them.

In the mean time, the second council of Lyons had been called together, and one of its professed objects was the reconciliation of the churches. It was still assembled, *Council of Lyons*, when (on June 24, 1274) the ambassadors from the East arrived. Several difficulties were still apprehended; and there were many who reasonably trembled, lest that solemn meeting of the universal church should be distracted by the passionate broils of an endless controversy. But the emperor had arranged it otherwise; and at the session which immediately followed, the Western fathers were edified and astonished by the voice of the prelates of the East, chaunting the *Double Procession*, in unison with the worship of the orthodox. The policy, which had dictated the humiliating concession, did not hesitate

occasion, remarked, that the schism had *then* lasted three hundred years. On the other hand, the emperor did not date with accuracy—from the breach between Photius and Nicholas, the space was above 360 years; from the dispute between Cerularius and Leo IX., not more than 180.

there; probably there was no depth of spiritual submission to which the emperor was not then prepared to descend: for it seemed to depend on the decision of that council, whether the armament, to which all Europe was contributing, should be directed against Syria or against himself. Accordingly, the Pope's supremacy was acknowledged without any scruple; and a communication from Palæologus was publicly recited, in which he professed, without any equivocation or cavil, every tenet laid down in the confession of Clement IV. The reunion of the churches was then officially announced; and the Pope pronounced the *Te Deum*, with his head uncovered, and his eyes suffused with unsuspecting joy.*

As long as the fears and necessities of the eastern empire continued, as long as the fragile vessel of state lay at the mercy of any tempest from the west, so long did this hollow truce subsist. But not quite ten years after its conclusion, Andronicus, having succeeded to the sceptre of his father, proceeded, without delay, to dissolve the union. A council was assembled at Constantinople; the hateful act of humiliation was repealed; and the revival of the schism was proclaimed amidst the acclamations of the clergy of Greece. One circumstance, indeed, is here particularly forced upon our attention. The motive which chiefly persuaded Andronicus to re-open that ancient wound was, that he might heal a still more dangerous disorder, which the reconciliation with Rome had inflicted upon his own Church. The power of Palæologus had secured the outward submission, but it had not changed the opinions, or the principles, or the passions, of his prelates; the great majority remained adverse to the re-union; and in their importunate and pressing clamours, the fears of an ancient and distant rival were forgotten. Howbeit the domestic dissensions of the Greeks were not even thus allayed; there were some too strongly impressed with the policy of their late connexion to applaud its hasty dissolution; and there remained ever afterwards a party in the East which professed its adhesion to the Roman communion.

We shall not pursue the insincere and fruitless overtures which were so often defeated and renewed during the fourteenth century, and especially under the Popes of Avignon. The pontificates of John XXII., of Clement VI., of Innocent VI., and Benedict XII., were particularly marked by those vain negotiations*; and during this period we may remark that the motives of both parties were equally removed from any spiritual consideration. If political exigencies invariably actuated the one, the other was now chiefly moved by pecuniary necessities. The military succours, which the Pope might be the means of raising, would be recompensed by obedient contributions to the apostolical treasury. According to the approach or suspension of immediate danger, the zeal for reconciliation burnt fiercely, or subsided; but the characters were still sustained under all circumstances. 'That old song respecting the Greeks (said the fathers of Basle) has already lasted for three hundred years, and every year it is chanted afresh.' At length the progress of the Turks excited a permanent alarm, and a proportionate sincerity; and we shall now shortly trace the chief events to which it led.

* It was on the last occasion that the emperor sent that Barlaam, whom we have already mentioned, (the same who instructed Petrarch in the rudiments of Greek,) to the court of Avignon. Sufficient accounts of these various negotiations are given by Bzovius, ad ann. 1331, s. i. 1339, s. 22, 1345-6-9, and particularly 1356, s. 22. On one occasion (in 1339) great efforts were made to show that the Greek opinions had always been the same with the Latin (after so many mutual excommunications!) and this, as we all know, furnished Leo Allatius in a later age with a fruitful field for sophistry. The detestation, which the Greeks still entertained for the Pope, is strongly expressed by the Patriarch Gennadius in a document which is cited by Bzovius, ann. 1349, s. 14.

After separate negotiations with Pope Eugenius and the Council of Basle, the Emperor of the East at length decided to accept the proposals of the former. An oriental despot might well be perplexed by the claims of two rival authorities, both professing to be legitimate and supreme, and both acknowledged by many adherents in their own communion. But whether his imperial prejudices inclined him towards the *Monarch* of the church, or from whatsoever other motive, he embarked (in November, 1427) with his patriarch, and numerous ecclesiastics, on the galleys of Eugenius, and arrived in due season at the appointed city, Ferrara. A trifling difference first arose respecting the seats to be respectively occupied during the conference by its spiritual and temporal presidents. But this was arranged by a compromise, by which the Pope conceded a part of his claim, but retained his pre-eminence. They were placed on different sides of the Church, but the Pope was on the right, and his throne was one step higher than that of the Emperor. The next proceeding, and it might occasion some surprise, if not distrust, among strangers, unused to the discords of the west, was the promulgation of a solemn anathema against the Council of Basle. All public deliberations were then adjourned for some months; but it was arranged that, during this interval, a select number of doctors of the two churches should frequently meet, and prepare the way by amicable discussions for a more speedy reconciliation.

Accordingly these deputies, who were, indeed, the leading members of both parties, did meet. On the one side was the celebrated Julian Cesarini, Cardinal of St. Angelo, and so lately the President of the rival Council; and with him were Andreas, Bishop of Colossus (or Rhodes), John a Doctor of Spain, and some others. Marc of Ephesus, and Bessarion, Archbishop of Nice, conducted the disputations, on the other. It was here agreed, seemingly without difference, that the articles by which the schism was entirely occasioned were four. (1) The Procession of the Holy Spirit. (2) The use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. (3) Purgatory. (4) The Primacy of the Pope. It was further settled, that the subject of the first discussion should be Purgatory.

Accordingly, Cardinal Julian laid down the doctrine of his Church on that matter as follows:—that the souls of the just, which are pure and without stain, and have been exempt from mortal sin, proceed directly to heaven, to the enjoyment of eternal happiness; but that the souls of men who have fallen into sin after their baptism, unless they have fully accomplished the penance necessary to expiate that sin, (even though they may have performed some penance,) and also manifested fruits worthy of their penitence, so as to receive entire remission, pass into the fire of purgatory; that some remain there for a longer, others for a shorter period, according to the nature of their offences; and that, being at length purified, they are admitted to beatitude. But that the souls of those who die in mortal sin are consigned to immediate punishment. . . . To this, Marc of Ephesus replied, that the doctrine, in the main, was that of the Greek Church; only that the latter did not admit the purification by fire, but held that sinful souls were sent into a place of darkness and mourning, where they remained for a season in affliction, deprived of the light of God. He admitted that they were purified, and delivered from this desolate abode by sacrifice and alms; but he held that the condemned would not be wholly miserable; and that the saints would not be admitted to perfect beatitude until after the resurrection of their bodies. . . . On this last point an unexpected difference arose between Marc of Ephesus and his col-

league, Bessarion, as to what really was the doctrine of their Church; and this was pressed to dispute and altercation. In the mean time, the season advanced, and these preliminary conferences were discontinued before the disputants had touched on any other subject, or arrived at any specific conclusion even upon that.

At length the formal deliberations of the Council commenced, and the first public session was held on the 8th of October; but there were some among the Greeks who, observing that the Fathers of Basle had shown, in the mean time, no indications of submission, began already to despair of any durable effect from their mission. However, the Prelates assembled in considerable numbers; the same were recognised by both parties, as the important subjects of difference, and it was agreed that the *first* of them was that, in which the whole difficulty of reunion was, in fact, involved. They prepared, in consequence, to argue the mystery of the Procession with becoming solemnity: and it was vainly hoped, that a question which had employed the learning and wearied the ingenuity of the Christian world for about eight hundred years, would finally be set at rest by the eloquence of the Doctors of Ferrara.

It must be admitted that the advocates of both opinions displayed on this occasion abundant talents, unwearied zeal, and resources almost inexhaustible, especially the Cardinal of St. Angelo*; who here exhibited, in defence of the doctrine of his Church, the same commanding faculties and energy with which he had urged, at Basle, the reformation of its discipline. Through fifteen tedious sessions the controversy was maintained with unabated ardour; and though the point principally argued was only, whether the words *Filioque* were, properly speaking, an addition or an explanation, it might have been supposed, from the warmth and prolixity of the orators, that the very existence of the Christian faith was at stake. At length, as no immediate result seemed at all probable, and as Ferrara was found, on many accounts, inconvenient for so large† an assemblage, the Pope, with the consent of the Emperor, adjourned the Council to Florence.

The Council of Florence held its first session on Feb. 26, 1439; and it opened with some proposals on the part of the
Removed to Florence. Emperor and Cardinal Julian, for arriving more directly at the practical object of these conferences—a public reconciliation. But no expedient was discovered for attaining that end, and the disputations were accordingly renewed. The results of the conferences at Ferrara had not been such, as either to bring the Latins to retrench the contested expression from the creed, or the Greeks to insert it: thus the Procession became once more the subject of debate. For the seven succeeding sessions the same assertions were advanced and denied, the same arguments reiterated and confuted. At length, however, the Latins found a new and powerful champion in John, provincial of the Dominicans. This learned mendicant, by reference to ancient manuscripts of St. Basil, and other Greek Fathers, professed to demonstrate, that those venerable Patriarchs had asserted the double Procession. This was an assault upon that point, on which alone the Greeks were very sensible.

* Tiraboschi (vol. vi. p. I, l. ii.) cites the testimony of Sguropulos, who was present at all these discussions, and expressed his astonishment at the eloquence of Julian.

† About one hundred and fifty Bishops, besides numerous Abbots, are said to have been present. We should here mention that the Greeks lived at the expense of the Pope, receiving a regular stipulated allowance from the Apostolical Treasury. Notwithstanding, so great was their despondency as to the result of the embassy, that they betrayed from time to time a strong desire to return to Greece.

Every shaft of reason might be foiled or blunted by sophistry or prejudice; every other authority might be suspected or disavowed; but when the archives of their own unerring Church were cited against them, it was hard indeed to raise any defence, or reply with any confidence. It would appear, too, that Bessarion had for some time taken little share in the disputes, and at length even Marc of Ephesus withdrew from the conference. The victory now appeared to rest with the Latins; when the Emperor, who possessed some skill in theology, and was sincerely desirous of the reunion, discovered what he considered an equitable method of compromise. In a letter of St. Maximus, that Father was found to have asserted, that 'the Latins, when they declare that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, do not pretend that the Son is the cause of the Holy Spirit, since they know very well that the Father is the only cause both of the Son and the Holy Spirit—of the Son by generation, of the Holy Spirit by Procession—they only mean, that the Holy Spirit proceeds *through* the Son, because he is of the same essence.' Soon after this proposal had been made, the public sessions of the Council were suspended, and the Greeks held several conferences among themselves, with a view to some honourable accommodation.

The Greeks were now openly divided. Bessarion, gained, as his adversaries assert, by the presents and promises of the Pontiff, at once avowed his adhesion to the Latin dogma, and defended it with confidence and eloquence. Of this same party was the Emperor, through his anxiety to reconcile the Churches on any terms, and at any sacrifice. Marc of Ephesus obstinately maintained his original opinions; he abhorred the *heresy* of the Latins, and rejected every overture of compromise. Nevertheless the conferences continued; several attempts were made to devise some explanation of the Oriental doctrine which might be satisfactory to the Latins; and the party of the Unionists gained ground. The Emperor saw his advantage, and pursued it by such means of persuasion as an Emperor may always exercise. And at length, after more than two months of discussion, the Greeks unanimously consented to the terms of reconciliation, with the single honest exception of Marc of Ephesus.

The confession of faith, on which this treaty of concord was founded, was as follows:—'In the name of the Holy Trinity, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, we, Latins and Greeks, agree in the holy union of these two Churches, and confess that all true Christians ought to receive this genuine doctrine: that the Holy Spirit is eternally of the Father and the Son, and that from all eternity it proceeds from the one and the other as from a single principle, and by a single production, which we call *Spiration*. We also declare that what some of the Holy Fathers have said, viz. that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, should be taken in such manner as to signify, that the Son, as well as the Father, and conjointly with him, is the principle of the Holy Spirit. And since, whatsoever the Father hath, that he communicates to his Son, excepting the paternity which distinguishes him from the Son and the Holy Spirit, so is it from the Father that the Son has received, from all eternity, that productive virtue through which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, as well as from the Father.'

We should here mention, that while this spiritual negotiation was in progress, another convention of a very different character was also under consideration; and the two *Treaties of Union*, treaties were brought to their conclusion at the same

time. It was stipulated by the latter, that his Holiness should furnish the Greeks with resources for their return; that he should maintain a standing military and naval force for the defence of Constantinople; that the galleys carrying pilgrims to Jerusalem should be compelled to touch at Constantinople; that, if the Emperor should require twenty galleys for six months, or for a year, the Pope should bind himself to supply them; and that, if soldiers were wanted, he should use his influence with the princes of the west to procure them. This convention having been officially ratified, the emperor announced the consent of his Prelates to the doctrinal accommodation; and on the 6th of June, 1439, it was announced, that the divisions of so many centuries were at length closed for ever. The Confession of Union was recited in Greek and in Latin, and it was hailed by the acclamations of both parties, who embraced with seeming warmth, and interchanged the salutation of peace.

It will have been observed, that the public disputations had been entirely confined to one of the four subjects of difference; and that the arrangement of that, as it was considered by far the most difficult question, was held to be a sufficient pledge of agreement upon all. And so indeed it proved. The difference on the Azymes was removed by the confession of the Greeks, that the Eucharist might be celebrated with unleavened, as worthily as with leavened, bread. Respecting Purgatory, it was acknowledged on both sides, that those souls which could neither, through some unatoned sins, be received into immediate beatitude, nor yet deserved eternal condemnation, were delivered into some abode of temporary duration and purification; but regarding the method of purification—whether it was by fire, as some thought, or by darkness and tempest, as seemed to be the opinion of others—it was held more prudent to abstain from any positive declaration. The question of the Pope's primacy occasioned somewhat greater embarrassment, because its practical consequence was more directly perceptible; and though the Imperial eye might overlook the importance of doctrinal differences, it was not blind to any encroachment on Imperial prerogative. And thus, though Palæologus readily assented to the *general* proposition of papal supremacy, he objected to its application in two cases. He would not consent that the Pope should call councils in his dominions without his approbation and that of the Patriarchs; nor would he permit appeals from the Patriarchal courts to be carried to Rome. He maintained that the Pope should send his legates to decide them on the spot. The Pontiff insisted; but as the Emperor declared that he would prefer to break off the negotiations even in that their latest stage, rather than yield those points, a method of verbal compromise was discovered, which satisfied the consciences of both parties.

To the attentive reader it will, perhaps, appear strange, that in so many controversies between the two Churches no dispute *Question on Trans-* had yet been raised on the subject of Transubstantiation. *substantiation.* And it will thence seem natural to infer, that, on that point, no difference existed between them. In a later age, when the Protestants were contending with the Roman Catholics for the spiritual adhesion of the Greeks, this important question was thoroughly investigated; and the result, as it appears to us*, was not quite favourable to either party. For, if some of the ancient Fathers indulged in very lofty expressions on the nature of the Eucharist, yet the Latin dogma was

This subject has been shortly treated by the author of this history, in a work 'On the Condition and Prospects of the Greek Church.'

never formally established among the Articles of the other Church. We shall now mention, that during the conferences at Ferrara and Florence certain expressions fell from the Greek Doctors, which excited suspicions of their orthodoxy so generally, that the Pope deemed it necessary to demand of them a formal declaration on that point, before the 'Decree of Union' should be finally ratified. Accordingly, Bessarion of Nice, on the part and in the presence of his brethren, made an affirmation to this effect:—' Since in the preceding congregations we have been suspected of holding an erroneous opinion touching the words of the Consecration, we declare, in the presence of your Holiness, . . . that we have learnt from our ancient Fathers, and especially from St. Chrysostom, that it is the words of our Lord which change the substance of the bread and wine into that of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; and that those divine words have the force and virtue to make that wonderful change of substance, or that Transubstantiation; and that we follow the sentiments of that great Teacher.' These expressions are, in themselves, sufficiently explicit: but, on the other hand, we are bound to recollect, that the Greeks at Florence had by this time abandoned in despair every manner of resistance to the Emperor and the Pope; and also, that the Prelate who read the declaration, and whose motives are liable to very well-founded suspicion, was afterwards exalted to the dignity of a Cardinal in the Roman Church*.

After this last confession of Bessarion, the 'Decree of Union' was signed and ratified; and the Greeks, *Return of the
Greeks.* their object accomplished, set forth, with various emo-

* Bessarion, an Asiatic Archbishop, ended his days in the peaceful enjoyment of a Roman dignity. His great antagonist, Julian Cesarini, Cardinal of St. Angelo, under a less auspicious influence, exchanged the field of controversial achievement for that of military dishonour. Let us here trace his concluding fortunes. Being appointed by the Pope to superintend, as his legate, the warlike operations against the Turks, he attached himself to the camp of Huniades. Under his sanction, and with his consent, (it was a reluctant consent,) a truce for ten years was signed, with religious solemnities, between the contending parties; and Amurat reposed in confidence on the shores of the Bosphorus, or employed his forces in some other enterprise. Suddenly some new circumstance came to light, which promised advantage to the Christians from the renewal of hostilities. Hereupon the Cardinal Legate, perceiving some hesitation among the generals, seized a favourable moment to counsel the violation of the truce. To this effect, he urged the impolicy of the secret engagement, the *infidelity* of the party with whom it was contracted. He pressed the injustice thereby offered both to the Pope and the Emperor; the prejudice done to their own reputation, and to the interests of the Church. He maintained that the very compact with the Turk was in itself an act of perfidy to their allies. These and similar arguments he advanced with his customary power. But seeing that his unlettered hearers were not yet persuaded, that a treaty so solemnly ratified could at once be violated without reproach, he proceeded more curiously to distinguish between the obligation due to a mere promise and that which is demanded by the public welfare, and to show the higher authority of the latter. Whenever these, forsooth, were at variance, the faith plighted to an infidel could have little solid weight. For though, in truth, an oath is binding, when it is just and founded in equity, it is properly considered as null, and displeasing to God, when it leads to private or public calamity, &c. &c.!

The eloquence of the Cardinal so well enforced his fallacies upon minds which probably were only thirsting for conviction, that the whole assembly demanded with acclamations the violation of the truce. The army moved forwards, and immediately engaged in that campaign, which was terminated by the battle of Varna. In that fatal encounter, among thousands of less illustrious victims, fell the Cardinal of St. Angelo. The nature of his death is uncertain. It is variously asserted that he was slain in the field, and in the rout; that he was drowned in the Danube; that he was plundered and murdered by Hungarian robbers. And it had been happier for his memory had the last struggle of his genius been wrapt in the same obscurity—could we forget that it was made for the purpose of corrupting the rude morality of Christian soldiers and statesmen, and leading them into that perjured enterprise, which ended in his destruction and their disaster, and the infamy of all.

tions perhaps, but with general satisfaction, on their return to the east. The voyage was favourable; and on the 20th of February, 1440, they were restored to the altars of Constantinople. With what feelings were these messengers of religious concord welcomed? What salutations hailed them on their arrival from that holy enterprise? The joy, the gratitude, the affection of their fellow-*Catholics*? Let us turn to the circumstances of their reception: through a general confederacy of the Clergy, of the people, and particularly of the Monks, who chiefly swayed the conscience and directed the movements of the people, the authors of the Union found themselves excluded even from their ecclesiastical functions. They were overwhelmed with insults. They were called *azymites*, apostates, traitors to the true religion; the sanctuaries which they entered were deserted; they were shunned, as if convicted of impiety, or blasted by excommunication; and in many of the Churches the spirit went so far, that the very name of the Emperor himself was erased from the *Dyptics*. On the other hand, Marc of Ephesus, who had fought without concession or compromise the battles of his Church, and persisted inflexibly in his repugnance to the reunion, was rewarded by universal acclamation. Marc of Ephesus had alone stood forth as the defender of the faith, and of the honour of the *Œcumenic Church*.

The controversy was immediately renewed in the East. Marc placed himself at the head of the schismatics, and many compositions were published, as well by himself as by others, to press the repeal of the Union. Various polemical treatises were also put forth in rejoinder; and at the same time the Emperor exerted, on the same side, a more equivocal method of persuasion. He selected for the Patriarch of Constantinople a decided supporter of the Union, and caused the patronage of the See to be conferred exclusively upon ecclesiastics of that party. . . . Within the limits of his temporal sovereignty the Head of the Oriental Church received a reluctant obedience. But beyond those boundaries, in the Patriarchats of Jerusalem, of Antioch, and Alexandria, his spiritual subjects—for they were no more than spiritual—broke forth into undisguised rebellion. In 1443 those three Prelates united in publishing a Synodal Epistle, in which they pronounced the sentence of deposition against all those, on whom their Brother of Constantinople had conferred ordination; and then added the threat of excommunication, in case this sentence should be neglected. At the same time they addressed to the Emperor himself a similar menace, should he still continue to protect his Patriarch.

A Synod, which combined the authority of three of their Patriarchs, was reverentially regarded by a people already predisposed to embrace its edicts. Even the resolution of Palæologus appears to have been shaken by so bold an act of insubordination. At the same time, as if to increase his confusion, the Clergy and populace of the Northern Provinces of his Church, Russia and Muscovy, loudly declared themselves against the Union, and insulted and imprisoned a Papal Legate who was sent to publish it among them. Thus, after his sojourn under foreign dominion, after his personal exertions in allaying the heats of controversy, and conducting it, as he fondly fancied, to a lasting termination, the Emperor of the East discovered that his ecclesiastical influence was confined almost to the city and suburbs of Constantinople; and that the treaty from which he expected such advantage was received even there with a reluctant and precarious, even though it was an interested, submission.

It might have been supposed that some sense of political advantage

would have moved the feelings of his subjects; that the prospect of a powerful alliance would have exerted some influence; that the sight of the advancing Turk would have inspired some moderation; or, if reason was, indeed, excluded from the controversy, that the passion of fear would, in some degree, have counteracted the passion of bigotry. Some mitigation of the first phrenzy might at least have been expected from time; and in the interval of eleven years, more charitable feelings, and more provident considerations might gradually have gained prevalence under the Imperial patronage. But the event was far otherwise: if the heat of either party relaxed during this critical period, it was that of the friends of the Union; its opponents increased in strength, and remitted nothing of their original rancour.

In the year 1451 Nicholas V., after engaging in some earnest endeavours to rouse the energies of Christendom against the common foe, issued a celebrated address to the Greeks. He exhorted them to pay some regard to their own safety, and not to paralyse the efforts which Providence was making to preserve them; to display their devotion in acts of penitence; and to receive, without delay, the decree of the Council of Florence. To the Emperor Constantine he addressed a menace, dictated, as some have thought, by a prophetic spirit. After complaining, that the Greeks had now too long trifled with the patience of God and man, in deferring their reconciliation with the Church, he announced that, according to the parable in the Gospel, three years of probation would still be granted for the fig-tree, hitherto cultivated in vain, to bring forth fruit. But, if it did not bear fruit in that season—if the Greeks, during the space which God still indulged to them, did not receive the decree of the Union—that then, indeed, the tree would be cut down even to its root—the nation extirpated by the ministers of divine justice.

Prediction of Nicholas V., and fall of the Greek Empire.

This denunciation contemplated no improbable catastrophe; and the Emperor took such measures as were left to him to conciliate the dispositions of the Vatican. But what was the spirit which at this last crisis animated his subjects? It was during this very year that several Greek ecclesiastics addressed, in the name of the whole Church, a communication to the rebels of Bohemia. They praised the zeal of their brother-schismatics; they applauded them for their rejection of the innovations of Rome, and their adherence to the true faith; and, finally, called on them to conclude a treaty of Union with themselves—not such union as that mockery of concord dressed up at Florence, from which truth was far removed, but Union, founded on the respectable opinions of the ancient Fathers! . . . And thus, those precious moments, which the Pope devoted to vows and exertions for the salvation of Greece, were employed by her zealous theologians in courting the bitterest enemies of his government.

In the year following, the Emperor having received with honour the Papal Legate, and made him some fair promises, they proceeded to celebrate the Liturgy in St. Sophia. But as soon as mention was made, in the course of the service, of the names of the Pope and the Latin Patriarch*, the whole city rose in commotion, and the multitude, uncertain what course to take, rushed in a mass to consult a popular fanatic, named Gennadius. This man was a monk; and attached to the door of his cell

* Gregory—then a voluntary exile at Rome, through his reluctance to preside over a rebellious Church.

they found a written rescript, denouncing the last inflictions against all who should receive the impious decree of Florence. Then it was that Priests and Abbots, Monks and Nuns, soldiers and citizens, the entire population, except the immediate dependents of the Emperor, shouted, as with a single voice—‘Anathema against all who are united with the Latins!’ The sanctuary of St. Sophia was proclaimed profane; all intercourse was suspended with all who had assisted at the service with the Latins; absolution was refused, and the Churches were closed against them.

This was the madness of a falling empire—this was the heaven-inflicted delirium which prepared the path for destruction. The measure of fanaticism was at length filled up; the pontifical prophecy* hastened to its accomplishment. And while the frantic people of Greece were in the highest ferment of theological excitement,—while their religious hatred against their brother Christians was burning most intensely,—while partial differences were most exaggerated,—while sectarian intolerance was most fierce and uncompromising, the banners of the Infidel were in motion towards the devoted city, and a nation of Christians was consigned in bondage to the common enemy of Christ.

Notes on Chapter XXVI.

NOTE (1) ON THE ARMENIANS.

THE first occasion on which we can observe the Armenians to have come into contact, as an independent communion, with the Church of Rome, was the following:—In the year 1145, while Pope Eugenius was resident at Viterbo, certain deputies from their patriarch (also called their *Catholic*), arrived to salute the Pontiff, and proffer every sort of respect and deference. The particular object of their mission appears, however, to have been this,—to appeal to the decision of the Pope respecting their differences with the Greek Church. The differences principally debated were two;—the Armenians did not mix water with the wine in the eucharist; they made use of leavened bread, excepting on the festivals of Christmas and the Epiphany. We do not learn that there were any lasting results from this embassy; but it is carefully recorded,† that the Orientals assisted at the Latin Mass celebrated by the Pope in person; and that one of them beheld on that solemnity a sunbeam resting on the head of the Pontiff, as well as two doves ascending and descending above him, in an inexplicable manner—a marvel which greatly moved him to reverence and submission.

Notwithstanding, the circumstances under which the Armenians next present themselves to the historian, prove the futility of the former overtures to Rome. For we find that, in the year 1170, the *Catholic* Norseis addressed a letter to Manuel Comnenus, in which he mentioned some points, whereon himself and the Greeks were not agreed, and expressed a strong desire for reconciliation. The Emperor entrusted the com-

* Constantinople was certainly taken in the third year (inclusive) after the prediction of Nicholas. The Pope wrote some time in 1451; the city fell on May 29, 1453. The coincidence, even with this latitude, was fortunate; but after the battle of Varna, no light from heaven was necessary to foreshow the speedy downfall of the Greek empire.

† By Otho Frisingensis, who was at that time at Viterbo.

mission to a philosopher named Theorian, who proceeded to Armenia, and conferred with the patriarch and another influential prelate. On this occasion much more important differences were advanced than those discovered at Viterbo; and that, which was most prominent, respected the nature of Christ. From the account of this controversy it would appear, that, in the outset, the Greeks supposed the Armenians to be involved in the Eutychian heresy; while the Armenians imagined the Greeks to have embraced the opposite error of Nestorius. In the course of the conference both were undeceived. The Armenians did indeed admit, that they held *one incarnate nature*; but not by confusion, like Eutyches, nor by diminition, like Apollinaris: but in the 'orthodox' sense of Cyril of Alexandria*. The Greeks cleared their own tenets from the charge of Nestorianism with equal perspicuity. The result was, that the Catholic acknowledged their orthodoxy, and undertook to bring over all his compatriots to the same opinion. Some other differences of inferior weight were also discussed; and these, too, the Armenian is related to have softened away with equal facility. At length, after an affecting interview, in which many tears were poured forth in pious sympathy by both parties, Theorian returned to Constantinople, and Narsesis prepared to communicate his own convictions to the Church over which he presided.

With what little success these negotiations were attended appears from the next glimpse that we catch of the ecclesiastical affairs of the Armenians. On the 23rd of May, 1199, Leo, their king, addressed an epistle to Innocent III., expressing his anxiety for the re-union of his Church with that of Rome. At the same time he disclosed the motive of his anxiety; for he deplored the ravages, to which his kingdom was exposed by the inroads of the infidels, and proclaimed the absolute need in which he stood of foreign succour. This application was accompanied by one from the Catholic, in which he professed his wish for reconciliation, and his readiness to make submission to the Vatican. The Pope sent, in reply, many civil expressions; and intended, no doubt, to confer a more substantial service on his militant fellow Christians, when he presented them at the same time with the standard of St. Peter, as a safeguard against the sword of the unbeliever. Some negotiations succeeded: at length (in the year 1205), the king prevailed upon his subjects to acknowledge their spiritual allegiance to the Pope; and the Catholic publicly placed the act of his submission in the hands of the legate. He accepted the *pallium* † from the same authority, and engaged to visit the holy See, by his Nuncios, once in every five years, and to assist in person, or by deputy, at all councils which might be held in the west for the regulation of his interests. Greater objections appear to have prevailed among those orientals against the introduction of the Roman code of canon law; but it was arranged that some part of its institutions should be received at once, and the rest

* See 'Theoriani Orthodoxi cum Catholico Armeniorum Colloquium,' in the *Maxima Biblioth. P.P.* tom. xxii. p. 796—812, (Edit. Lugdun. 1677). 'Dicimus in Christo naturam unam esse, non secundum Eutychen confundentes, nec secundum Apollinarem detrahentes, sed secundum Alexandrinum Antistitem Cyrillum, in Orthodoxia, quæ in libro contra Nestorium scripsit, unam esse naturam *Sermonis* incarnatam'. . . . The controversy turned a good deal on the distinction (real or imaginary) between *Christus* and *Sermo*, in this question.

† See the Letter from Leo to Innocent, published by Raynaldus, ann. 1205, in which he boasts, that, with great labour, and through divine grace, he had at length brought about that obedience of the Armenians to the Roman Church, which his ancestors had so long attempted in vain.

at some future time, after more mature deliberation among the Armenian prelates. Such was the general nature of the reconciliation then effected; but some dissensions presently arose between the king and one of the pontifical legates; and there seems no reason to believe that the above negotiation had any lasting consequences.*

As the amicable overtures from Armenia to Rome were entirely occasioned by the political necessities of the former, they were more frequent during the desolation of the East in the fourteenth century. The interested obedience of that communion was tendered to John XXII., and accepted by him. A few years afterwards (in 1341) we observe another king, named Leo, soliciting temporal assistance from Benedict XII. The Pope made answer in two letters, respectively addressed to the king and to the Catholic. In the former, he made mention of the errors entertained by the Armenians, and of the exertions which he had made, both by personal inquiry from those professing them, and by the examination of the authorized books, to ascertain their nature and extent. In the latter, he exhorted the clergy to assemble in council, to condemn and extirpate the false opinions which they held, and then, for their better instruction in the faith and observances of the Roman Church, to receive the Decrees, the Decretals and other Canons used in the West. He expressed a pious persuasion, that when the errors of the Armenians should once be removed, the enemies of the faith would no longer prevail against them; and concluded his address by the proposal of a conference.

The first of these epistles was accompanied by a memorial, in which the errors in question were enumerated. They were expanded into a tedious catalogue of one hundred and seventeen; but they may, without much inaccuracy, be reduced under the following heads:—1. The Armenians were accused of adhesion to the opinions of Eutyches, involving, of course, the Monophysite heresy, the rejection of the council of Chalcedon, the condemnation of St. Leo, and the secession from both the Œcumenic Churches. 2. They were charged with administering the sacraments of confirmation and the eucharist, together with that of baptism—a practice which (as Fleury observes) had very early prevalence in the Church. 3. They mixed no water with the wine in the holy communion—which again was an ancient usage. 4. They rejected Transubstantiation, and maintained that it was the figure only, not the real body, that was received by the Communicants—an opinion which was then naturally considered as a consequence of the Eutychian error respecting the nature of Christ—for if any doubts were thrown on the reality of Christ's body on earth, the same would extend in an equal (if not in a greater) degree, to the reality of his flesh in the sacrament of his supper. The other imputations concerned some fabulous notions respecting the resurrection, the last judgment, the place of punishment, the earthly and heavenly paradise, the intermediate state, and other questionous of difficult determination.

In consequence of the pontifical remonstrances, the Patriarch assembled his council, and condemned all the imputed errors; he then sent deputies

* From the fragment of a Greek writer, named Nico, (probably of the thirteenth century,) translated and published in the *Max. Bibliotheca P.P.* (tom. xxv. p. 328), and entitled 'De Pessimorum Armeniorum pessima Religione,' it appears that they still retained all the errors imputed to them by either Church. Among a multitude here enumerated it is one, that 'they do not adore the venerable images, but, on the contrary, that their Catholic anathematizes those who do so. Neither do they worship the Cross, until they have driven a nail into it, and baptized it,' &c.

to the succeeding Pope (Clement VI.), charged with a general obligation, to retract any other obnoxious opinions which might thereafter be discovered; and at the same time to acknowledge the Bishop of Rome as the chief of the Church of Christ, and to solicit copies of the decretals, for the more faithful administration of his own subordinate communion. The Pope engaged to send them, and in November, 1346, despatched two legates on a mission to the East.

Five years afterwards, the Pontiff, still dissatisfied with the communications (perhaps equivocal) which he received from his new subjects, and desiring a more express declaration of their opinions on those points which most interested himself, addressed the Catholic of Lesser Armenia in terms not substantially different from the following:—‘Since we are unable clearly to collect your opinions from your answers, we desire distinctly to propose the following questions:—Do you believe that all who at their baptism have received the Catholic faith, and have afterwards separated from the communion, are Schismatics and heretics, if they persist in such separation? and that no one can be saved, who has renounced obedience to the Pope? Do you believe that St. Peter received from Jesus Christ full power of jurisdiction over all the faithful? that all the power which the apostles may have possessed in certain provinces was subject to his? and that all the successors of St. Peter have the same power with himself? Do you believe that, in virtue of that power, the Pope can judge all the faithful immediately, and delegate to that effect such ecclesiastical judges as he may think proper? Do you believe that the Pope can be judged by no one, except God himself; and that there is no appeal from his decisions to any judge? Do you believe that he can translate bishops, and abbots, and other ecclesiastics from one dignity to another, or degrade and depose them, if they deserve such punishment? Do you believe that the Pope is not subject to any secular power, even regal or imperial, in respect to institution, correction, or destitution; that he alone can make general canons, and grant plenary indulgences, and decide disputes on matters of faith?’ . . . These interrogations were accompanied by the notice of some Armenian errors on the intermediate state, on the sacraments, and especially the Eucharist; and by some complaints, that promises, hitherto made with facility, had not been sufficiently observed. But they chiefly merit the historian’s attention, as they prove the uncompromising severity with which Rome, even during the exile of her Pontiffs, exacted all her usurped ecclesiastical rights, and imposed the whole weight and pressure of her yoke even on the most distant and most reluctant of her subjects. Howbeit, after that period, we do not observe any proof of the continuance or renewal of friendly negotiation between Rome and Armenia, sufficiently important to deserve a place in this history.

NOTE (2) ON THE MARONITES.

MARO, or Maroun, from whom this sect derives its appellation, lived during the latter part of the sixth century on the banks of the Orontes; and in the disputes then prevailing between the eastern and western Churches, he exerted his influence, which was considerable in that part of Syria, in favour of the latter. About a century later, a certain John, surnamed the Maronite, was distinguished by his opposition to the Melchites Greeks; and it seems to have been under his guidance, that the Syrian

'rebels'* settled apart in the secure recesses of Libanus and Antilibanus. There they formed a powerful association, formidable alike to the orthodox Greeks and to the Mahometan invader. . . . The first crusades brought them once more into immediate contact with the Latins; but not always as allies, nor by any means as members of the same ecclesiastical communion. For it appears certain, that the Maronites had imbibed, in the first instance, the opinions of the Monothelites, and that they long maintained them, together with some other peculiarities in rites and discipline. At length, however, about the year 1182, they were induced to abandon their leading error, and were then received into the bosom of the Roman Church.

At the same time it was stipulated, that the Pope should in no respect interfere with any of their ancient practices or ceremonies; consequently they continued to observe the discipline of the Greek Church, regarding the marriage of the clergy, and to administer the eucharist in both kinds, and according to the manner generally in use in the East. They retained, too, in other matters, a much closer resemblance to their original, than to their adopted, communion. Nevertheless, they have faithfully preserved the name of obedience to Rome from that time to the present; and if the contributions, which they have continually received from the apostolical treasury, should occasion any suspicion respecting the motives of their fidelity, it is worthy, at least, of observation, that the pecuniary current has invariably set in that direction, and that the more ordinary principles of the Vatican have never extended to the oppression of its Maronite subjects.

CHAPTER XXVII.

From the Council of Basle to the beginning of the Reformation.

The real weight of General Councils as a part of the Constitution of the Church—Circumstances preceding the accession of *Nicholas V.*—His popular qualities—Love of all the Arts—His public virtues—Recorded particulars of his Election—Concord with Germany—Celebration and abuse of the Jubilee—Death of the Cardinal of Arles—His recorded miracles and canonisation—Efforts to unite the Christian States against the Turks—Dissatisfaction and Death of *Nicholas—Callistus III.*—Crusading enthusiasm of *Æneas Sylvius*—Jealousy between the Pope and *Alphonso of Arragon*—Nepotism of the former—*Æneas Sylvius* justifies the Pope against the complaints of the Germans—His history—The circumstances of his elevation to the Pontificate—The Council of Mantua, for the purpose of uniting Europe against the Turks—The project of *Pius II.*—Failure of the whole Scheme—Embassy to Rome from the Princes of the East—*Thomas Palæologus* arrives at Rome—Canonization of *Catharine of Sienna*—The Bull of *Pius II.* against all appeals from the Holy See to General Councils—The Pope retracts the errors into which he fell, as *Æneas Sylvius*—Probable motive of his apostacy—His speech in Consistory—Departure against the Infidels—Arrival at Ancona, and Death—His Character—Compared to *Nicholas V.*, and Cardinal *Julian*—Conditions imposed by the Conclave on the future Pope—Remarks—*Paul II.* is elected, and immediately violates them—A native of Venice—Principles of his Government—He diverts the War from the Turks against the Hussites, and persecutes a literary Society at Rome—*Sixtus IV.* makes a faint attempt to rouse Christendom against the Turks—Violent broil between the Pope and the Florentines—Otranto taken by the Turks—Excessive Nepotism of this Pope—Institution of the Minimes—Increased venality of the Court of Rome—The moral character, talents, learning of *Sixtus*—Elevation of *Innocent VIII.*—Violation of the oath taken in Conclave—Preferment conferred on his illegitimate Children—His weakness and his avarice—The great wealth, election, and reputation of *Alexander VI.*—Distribution of his Benefices, &c. among the Cardinals who voted for him

* They were then called *Mardaites*—which means *Rebels*. The reader is familiar with the picture of the Maronites drawn in *Volney's* admirable *Travels in Syria*.

—Great Festivities at Rome—Moral profligacy and indecency of the Pope—His projected alliance with the Sultan Bajazet—He confers the possession of the New World on the Kings of Spain—The Act contested by the Portuguese—On what ground—His negotiations with Charles VIII. of France—History and fate of Zizim, brother of Bajazet—Cæsar Borgia, Duke of Valentino, or Valentino—His co-operation with his father—The object of their common ambition—Probable circumstances of the death of Alexander VI.—Expressions of Guicciardini—*Pius III.* dies immediately after his election—Julian della Rovéra, or *Julius II.* unanimously elected—His policy and character—His dispute with Louis XII.—Ecclesiastical scruples of the latter—Julius resumes the possession of the States of the Church, and extends them—His extraordinary military and political talents—Encouragement of the Arts—Lays the foundations of St. Peter's—A Council convoked by the Cardinals against the Pope—Its entire failure—Julius convokes the fifth Lateran Council—Subjects discussed by it till his death—Continuation of the Council under *Leo X.*—A number of constitutions enacted by it—Its edict to restrain the Press—Its abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, through the co-operation of Francis I.—Dissolution of the Council—Observations—On the gradual degeneracy of the See—Of the Government of the successive Popes—their Nepotism—On the morality of the Conclave—Obligations undertaken there on Oath—Reasons of their perpetual violation—Ignorance of Cisalpinæ respecting the real character of the Court of Rome—Respectability ascribed to it through the merits of its literary Pontiffs—The great use made by the Popes at this period of the dangers of a Turkish invasion, in order to suppress the question of Church Reform.

THE council of Bâsle, after its protracted and resolute struggle with the Vatican, having at length dissolved itself, and Felix V., its creature, having resigned his ill-supported pretensions to the Chair of St. Peter, the prospects of the Court of Rome once more brightened, and its authority was again secure from any immediate invasion. As a restraint on papal despotism, a General Council was effectual, so long as the council was assembled; and even its name and the menace of an appeal to it, as a last resource, have operated, on more occasions than one, with salutary influence on the fears of an arbitrary Pope. But the power of the Monarchy was continuous; its principles were never suspended; its action was uniformly directed to the same object—whereas the controlling body, the Senate of the Church, had only an occasional and very precarious existence; and even when it was most efficaciously in action, it was liable to all the incidents which throw uncertainty into the deliberations of very large assemblies. It is true that the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Bâsle had endeavoured, by express enactments, to make their sittings periodical, so as to erect the Council General into a permanent branch of the constitution of the Church. But as the power of convoking it still remained with the Pope; as the collecting together of so large a body of prelates from all parts of Europe must always have occasioned many local evils; and as the general consent, and even private inclinations, of the more powerful sovereigns were not, under such circumstances, to be disregarded, it was easy for the Pontiff to evade an obligation which he detested. So, in fact, it proved; for when they had once shaken off the fetters that were forged for them at Bâsle, the successors of Eugenius IV. carefully abstained, for above half a century, from acknowledging any power in the Church, except their own.

The moment of the accession of Nicholas V. was even favourable to the unlimited supremacy (the high Papists called it the Independence) of the Court of Rome. The faithful children of the Church had now, for seventy years, been distracted by dissensions almost uninterrupted. The schism which had dissevered kingdoms, and dishonoured the Church, had been *seemingly* aggravated by the council of Pisa; and no sooner was it appeased, after many fierce disputes at Constance, than a third assembly succeeded, which occasioned (to all appearances) a new broil, and which ended by creating a second schism. The spectacle of a Pope and a council launching anathemas against each other was not calculated to

edify the devout Catholic, nor even to conciliate towards the council the affections of the unthinking, who form the majority of mankind. But when the Pope assembled his rival council at Ferrara, and when the two infallible antagonists interchanged the bolts of excommunication, we may fairly believe that the dignity of those venerable bodies suffered much in popular opinion, and even that their utility was made matter of serious question. Wearied by continual dissension, and disgusted by endless exhibitions of ecclesiastical discord, many were disposed to acquiesce in the unrestrained licentiousness of the Vatican, as the lesser evil.

Again, the formidable successes of the Turks, and their near approach to the capital of the East, diverted the attention of men from their spiritual grievances to a more sensible object; and the zeal which Nicholas displayed in that, the common cause of all Christendom, reconciled many to an authority, so earnestly exercised in so holy a cause. Above all, the personal character of that Pope was of great use in conciliating the disaffected, and rallying them under the pontifical banners. His reputation, his talents, his pursuits, were in accordance with the spirit, which, in Italy, at least, so peculiarly prevailed at that time, for the cultivation of ancient literature. His gradual ascent from an inferior origin to the highest dignity was truly ascribed to his literary genius and accomplishments; and having attained that eminence, he surrounded it—not with sensualists or sycophants,—but with men of study and erudition, whose society he loved, and whose affection he obtained. A multitude of transcribers and translators were continually in his employment; and the learning of the Greeks was placed within the reach of an ordinary education. He founded the Vatican library, and sent his messengers into every country for the collection of rare and valuable manuscripts; and while he sought to amass the most precious treasures of profane lore, he exerted even greater zeal to multiply authentic copies of the sacred writings.

But neither was his polite taste, nor the profusion of his liberality, confined entirely to literary objects. His patronage was bestowed on the arts, and especially on that of architecture. He embellished his capital with several superb edifices; many churches, which had fallen into ruins during the schisms and disorders of preceding generations, were now restored to more than their ancient splendour; and the ground was prepared, and the foundations traced out, on which the least unworthy temple which man has ever dedicated to Omnipotence, was destined to rise. The talents of Nicholas were illustrated by private as well as public virtues*. He discouraged the practice of Simony, so long habitual to the Court of Rome; and the records of his history permit us once more to associate the word 'charity' with the character of a Pope. Such were purposes

* We may be allowed to cite (from Platina) a part of his epitaph, because the praises it offers were really well founded:—

Hic sita sunt Quinti Nicolai Antistitis ossa,
 Aurea qui dederat sæcula, Roma, tibi.
 Consilio illustris, virtute illustrior omni,
 Excoluit doctos doctior ipse viros.
 Abstulit errorem, quo Schisma infecerat orbem,
 Restituit mores, mœnia, templa, domos.
 Attica Romanæ complura volumina linguae
 Prodidit—en tumulto fundite thura sacro.

on which the revenues of the Church were honourably employed, and for which they were less reluctantly contributed; and such the character which, being raised at that moment to the pontifical chair, conciliated minds already weary with dissension, and seduced them into a temporary acquiescence in acknowledged abuses.

When the Cardinals went into conclave, on the death of Eugenius, nothing was farther from their intention, or from general expectation, than the election of Nicholas. Prosper Colonna was the person on whom the choice was expected to fall; and though the common proverb was not then forgotten, 'that he who enters the conclave Pope, comes out Cardinal,' (*chi entra Papa, esce Cardinale*) still among the names at all connected with success Thomas of Sarzana was not mentioned. Eighteen Cardinals were present; and, after two or three scrutinies, eleven were united in favour of Colonna; one only was wanting to give him the requisite majority. At that moment the Cardinal of St. Sixtus is reported to have turned suddenly to Sarzana, and said to him, 'Thomas, I give my vote to you, because this is the eve of St. Thomas!' It was, in fact, the eve of St. Thomas Aquinas. The rest of the College immediately followed the example, and Thomas of Sarzana was unanimously elected*.

One of the first acts of Nicholas was, to sign a Concordat with the German Church. Its provisions did not extend beyond the subject of patronage; and it was arranged that the Pope should appoint to all great benefices of every description which should become vacant *in curia*; to all vacated by Cardinals, or other officers of the Roman Court; and to all inferior benefices which should fall during six alternate months of the year. The rest appear to have been left at the disposal of the Ordinaries; all (except the smallest) being liable to the payment of Annates, according to the tax of the Apostolical Chamber; and all to Papal confirmation. This Concordat, properly considered, was the substantial effect produced by the Council of Basle upon the constitution of the Church of Germany; it was for this end that the labours of so many pious prelates and learned doctors had been exhausted! Yet even this result, as we shall presently see, was not such as to secure the satisfaction or bind the faith of the Court of Rome.

In the year 1450 the avarice of the Roman Clergy and people was again nourished by the celebration of the jubilee; and so vast were the multitudes which on this occasion sought *Jubilees*, the plenary indulgence at the tombs of the apostles, that many are said to have been crushed to death in Churches, and to have perished by other accidents†. Nevertheless, as there were still many devout persons, particularly in the more remote countries of Europe, who were precluded from reaping the promised rewards by personal disabilities, Nicholas, in imitation of the abuse of his

* The Roman people were allowed to retain (in return, perhaps, for their long-lost share in the election) the licentious privilege of plundering the mansion of the Pope elect. On this occasion it happened, that Prosper Colonna, as first Deacon, had the office of communicating the election from the window to the assembled populace. Now the people, knowing him to be the favourite, thought no other than that he had appeared to announce his own election. Consequently they rushed, without further inquiry, to his magnificent palace, and stripped it bare. After they had learnt their mistake, they proceeded to atone for it by plundering Sarzana also; but he was a scholar, and had little to lose.

† Ninety-seven pilgrims, for instance, were thrown at once by the pressure of the multitude from the bridge of St. Angelo, and drowned.

predecessors, afforded them facilities to redeem their omission. To the Poles and Lithuanians a private jubilee was accorded, on the condition, that every pious person should pay for his indulgence only half of the money which the pilgrimage to Rome would have cost him; but through some sense of shame, as is said, at the enormous sums which would thus have been raised, the proportion was finally reduced to one quarter. Of the proceeds, which were still considerable, half was consigned to the King of Poland, for the prosecution of the holy war, a fourth to the Queen Sophia, for charitable uses, and a fourth for the reparation of the Roman Churches. In this instance we have the unusual consolation of believing, that the money thus levied upon superstition, and levied, too, chiefly upon the superstition of the poor, was applied, for the most part, to the purposes professed. There are shades in the colours of religious imposture; and the sin of deluding a credulous race would have been still blacker, had it been followed by perfidy, or had its fruits been expended in pampering the profligacy of the Court of Rome.

In that year, also, died the Cardinal of Arles, the same who had succeeded Julian Cesarini as the President of the Council of Basle. But the history of that eminent ecclesiastic did not terminate at his death. On the interment of his body at Arles, many extraordinary miracles were performed at his tomb; and their fame spread so widely, and with such assurance of truth, that the partizans of the rival Council of Florence were struck with confusion. This Prelate had been excommunicated by Pope Eugenius, and stigmatized as the author of schism, the child of perdition, the nursling of iniquity; he had been condemned by two General Councils for rebellion against the Church, and degraded and deprived of all his dignities. He had continued, notwithstanding, in the exercise of his episcopal functions at Arles; and so lasting was the impression of his sanctity—founded on his charitable disposition, and other Christian excellencies—and so pressing was the importunity of his devotees, who had even anticipated in their prayers the determination of the Vatican, that at length Pope Clement VII. published (in 1527) the Bull of Beatification; and by that act exalted among the holy mediators the denounced, anathematized foe of Pontifical corruption and despotism.

If Nicholas V. had made some ineffectual exertions to preserve the Eastern empire, while there seemed yet some hope of its preservation, he redoubled his efforts where the shadow of a hope no longer existed. The fall of Constantinople, though long foreseen, fell like an unexpected bolt upon the nations of the West; and it was quickly perceived that the capital of the ancient Empire, the throne of the Christian religion, the opulent palaces and cities of Italy, presented peculiar temptations to an ambitious, unbelieving depredator. Accordingly numerous religious persons began to preach a new crusade; and while Æneas Sylvius was astonishing the Princes of Germany by his polished eloquence, a simple Monk, a hermit of St. Augustine, was exerting a more successful influence over the republics of Italy. His name was Simonet; he was destitute of all acquirements; but his natural address won the confidence of those who listened to him. He traversed the country, in repeated journeys, with unwearied activity. At Venice, at Milan, at Florence, he reiterated his counsels and his arguments. The orator was disinterested, and his object was the concord of his hearers. It was by such simple machinery, that he prevailed in effecting an union among those powerful cities. Yet the practised states-

men of the day were confounded * when they learnt, that a humble, undistinguished Monk, without rank, without wealth, without any worldly support, had accomplished an enterprise which the Pope, and his Court of Cardinals, had attempted in vain.

In the midst of his chivalrous designs to recover Constantinople, and expel the conqueror from Europe, and at a moment when there seemed some prospect of a partial co-operation for that purpose, Nicholas V. died. His complaint was gout; and it is commonly asserted, that its progress was hastened by the affliction with which he saw the triumphs of the infidel. It is at least certain, that during the two or three last years of his life the natural suavity of his temper deserted him; that he became morose, and even cruel; fearful of his enemies, and suspicious of his friends; querulous, and discontented even with the Chair of St. Peter. 'No man (he once said) ever crosses my threshold who tells me a word of truth. I am confounded by the artifices of those who surround me; and if I was not restrained by the fear of scandal, I would resign the Pontificate, and become once more Thomas of Sarzana. Under that name I had more enjoyment in a single day, than any year can henceforth ever bring me.' Nicholas, however amiable in his domestic qualities, had been ever unable to recognize any political rights in the subjects of the state; and thus he had persecuted the patriots of his day with precipitate severity. In consequence, it is made a natural question by the author of 'The Italian Republics,' whether it was not remorse, rather than commiseration, which embittered and curtailed his declining days.

Alphonso Borgia, a native of Spain, was chosen as his successor, and assumed the name of Calixtus III. Scarcely was he established in his dignity, when Æneas Sylvius presented himself at Rome, the bearer of the most flattering assurances on the part of the Emperor, both respecting his own military preparations, and the general eagerness for the Turkish war. In an animated address to the Pope and Cardinals, the orator depicted the dangers which impended over Europe: he then dilated upon the great numerical superiority of the Christians—that many Princes of Germany had taken the vow; that the King of Arragon was in readiness; that the Duke of Burgundy was ardent for the enterprise. Charles of France would not fail to emulate the zeal of his predecessors; the ancient courage of the English would not now desert them; the Castilians, the Portuguese, all nations, in short, awaited only the pontifical summons to arm for the defence of religion—if his Holiness would only second the vows of the faithful, by unlocking the treasures of the Church, and sending the labourers to the harvest. . . . These magnificent declarations were, for the most part, the spontaneous fruits of the orator's enthusiasm—that they had no result, is not to be entirely ascribed to the lukewarmness of the Pope. Yet it is remarkable that, among the various Princes announced as forming that holy confederacy, the first who withdrew from it, and that, too, in consequence of personal dissension with the Pontiff, was Alphonso of Arragon. Borgia had been the subject of that monarch—more than that—he had been engaged in his domestic service, and owed his ecclesiastical advancement to the same patronage. On his elevation to the Chair, Alphonso sent ambassadors to inquire of his Holiness, what terms were hereafter to subsist between them? Calixtus peevishly replied,

* 'Visum est id omnibus monstri simile humilem et incognitum monachum Italianum pacaviase.' Æneæ Sylv. Hist. de Europa, cap. 68, p. 460, edit. Basil. See Platina, Vit. Nic. V. ad finem.

‘Let him rule his kingdom, and leave the government of the Church, without any interference, to me.’ Some have considered the reply as too harsh, while others have discovered in the overture of Alphonso a want of due veneration for the Vicegerent of Christ. Probably, the monarch had not forgotten, and perhaps the Pontiff could not forgive, the relation which had formerly subsisted between them; and their knowledge of each other’s character may have been too deep and intimate to leave much room for reverence on either side.

Calixtus III. reigned only three years, and died in August, 1458, at a very advanced age. His pontificate was signalized

*The System of
Nepotism.*

by no striking incident, nor were his acts in any respect remarkable, unless, indeed, we should consider him as having introduced into the government of the Church the system of Nepotism. For, though instances of that vice had occasionally occurred before, it was not till now that it became the practice of the Vatican. Calixtus exhausted upon his worthless nephews the riches of the Apostolical Treasury, and limited his ambition to the aggrandizement of his own family. It was to this that the aspirations of pontifical presumption sank at last! From that lofty spiritual arrogance, which, in earlier ages, has extorted from us something approaching to admiration, the character of papacy first descended to the grasping after temporal power; its great object then became to enlarge the dominions of the See—to secure the obedience of the city. Avarice attended; still its fruits were, for the most part, applied to ecclesiastical objects—to maintain the interests of the Church, and extend the authority of the Vicar of Christ. Intrigues and wars flowed from the Vatican, and deluged Europe with blood; still they were designed to extend the power, to augment the dignity, of *Rome*. It was for the declining years of Papal despotism, that the last and lowest degradation was reserved: it was not till the age of Calixtus III. and Sixtus IV. that the ambition of St. Peter’s successors degenerated into mere family passion, and was confined to the narrowest circle of selfishness.

In the year preceding his death, Calixtus was accused by the Germans of having raised exorbitant contributions, under the pretext of a holy war, and violated the Concordat made

*Policy of
Æneas Sylvius.*

with his predecessor. There was considerable ground for both these complaints. Nevertheless, it was on this occasion that Æneas Sylvius, formerly the adversary of pontifical oppression, more recently the advocate of the Imperial claims, came forward in defence of the Pope, and vigorously maintained his rights and justified his conduct. In some letters, composed during this dispute, he reproached the German Prelates for deferring to any other authority, rather than the chief of the Church*. He asserted that their grievances, even had they been real, should have been left to the remedial benevolence of the Holy See; he applied himself to confute some arguments against its authority, which were derived from the Councils of Constance and Basle; he made mention of a sort of Pragmatic Sanction, established by certain Prelate-Princes of Germany, with a view to degrade the Holy See; and he reproached the nation with an unnatural ingratitude, in having resolved

* He went to the utmost extent of papal orthodoxy, by asserting, ‘that none who had disregarded the authority of the Roman Pontiff, could at any time enter the kingdom of heaven, and that those, who had spurned the commands of the Apostolical See, should not now have any occasion for exultation. Hos enim Catholica veritas, nisi resipuerint ante obitum, ignis æterni mancipio sine intermissione deputat.’ *Æn. Sylv. Epist. lib. i. Ep. 369, &c.*

to withhold contributions from Rome, to prevent appeals, to restore elections to the Ordinaries, to refuse Annates, and so, in effect, to deprive the Sovereign Pontiff of the plenitude of his power.

It is important to notice these particulars, because they indicate the secret working of that spirit, which, in the next generation, broke forth with irresistible violence. Nor is it without a feeling of sorrow, mingled with shame, that we observe the most enlightened ecclesiastic of his age casting off the wise and generous principles of earlier life, as his ambition was warmed by a nearer prospect of gratification, and as his selfish interests became more closely associated with ecclesiastical corruption. Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini was born at Corsigni, near Sienna, in 1405, and his first laurels were gathered at the Council of Basle; he remained faithful to that Assembly, and promoted its objects, and advanced his own reputation in the conduct of some important missions which were confided to him. In the year 1442 he became secretary to the Emperor Frederic; but throughout the pontificate of Nicholas V. he was engaged in the service of the Holy See, and zealously exerted himself, as its Nuncio, in a cause which was always dear to him, to confederate the Christian powers against the Turkish aggressor.

He was raised to the dignity of Cardinal (of Sienna) by Calixtus III., and on the death of that Pope he entered into Conclave with his brethren. The first scrutiny was indecisive; but it was followed by a very effective intrigue, which seemed likely to terminate in the election of the Archbishop of Rouen, an ambitious and unprincipled Frenchman. Piccolomini exerted all his eloquence and influence against that choice; he addressed several of the Cardinals separately; he appealed to their consciences, to their interest, to their vanity; he exaggerated the vices of the Archbishop; he addressed the national jealousy of his compatriots; he threatened them with a second secession to Avignon, and painted the approaching shame and desolation of Italy. The College proceeded a second time to the scrutiny. The golden chalice was placed upon the altar, and the Cardinals of Rouen, of Rimini, and Colonna remained near it. The others took their appointed seats, and, rising in succession, according to seniority, they placed in the chalice the paper which expressed their suffrage. When Sylvius went up in his turn, the Cardinal of Rouen, who knew how bitter an enemy he was, hastily said to him, 'Remember me on this occasion.' 'What,' replied Piccolomini, 'do you address me, who am but a vile worm of earth!' He resumed his place; and when the scrutiny was finished, and the papers examined, it appeared that the Cardinal of Sienna had nine votes, and that of Rouen six only.

Three still were wanting to the former to make good his election; and the Cardinals then proceeded to the *accessit*. For some time they sat in profound silence. One of them at length arose, and gave his voice to Piccolomini; it was a thunderbolt for the Cardinal of Rouen. There was a second interval of silence, and during it those individuals who had any hopes for themselves, having penetrated the secret, that Piccolomini was on the point of being elected, left their places on various pretexts. Presently another Cardinal gave his vote to Sylvius; and only one more being now required, Prosper Colonna rose; and though the Cardinals of Rouen and Nice endeavoured to prevent his design by a charge of perfidy, he gave his decisive suffrage to Piccolomini. The latter was then saluted Pope by the whole College; and after replying, with great modesty, to the excuses and congratulations of the opposite party, tendered by Bessarion of

Nice, he assumed the name of Pius II., and went through the customary solemnities.

The object to which the exertions of Æneas Sylvius had been faithfully directed in all his subordinate offices, equally distinguished his pontificate; and the gradual progress of the *Council of Mantua*. Turks, by increasing his apprehensions, fortified his zeal. Accordingly he allowed not a moment to elapse before he convoked a Council for the promotion of a general crusade. Mantua was the place selected for that purpose; his call was obeyed by the greater number of the Italian Princes; and, finally, though with more reluctance, by representatives from most of the European States. Many deputies from the East were also present—from Rhodes, from Cyprus, from Lesbos, from the Peloponnesus, Epirus, and Illyria—to express their sufferings or their fears, and pour out their supplications. Pius II. proceeded with extraordinary pomp to the opening of the Council. In various cities through which he passed he was received with the same ostentatious homage which is paid to a temporal Prince; and the religious motive which *may* have animated the Pontiff was forgotten in the less questionable policy of his design.

Pius II. opened the Council of Mantua on the 1st of June, 1459, just six years after the fall of Constantinople. His first discourse was employed in rebuking the indifference of the Christian Princes; in contrasting the devotion of the Turks for their execrable sect with the apathy of the children of the Gospel; and in expressing his own resolution never to abandon his project, but to sacrifice his life, if necessary, for the people entrusted to him by God. His earnestness, his activity, his brilliant and commanding eloquence, produced an immediate, though it proved but a temporary, effect. The Council continued its sessions till the end of the January following: as its deliberations proceeded, it increased in numbers and dignity; and it grew warmer in the cause, as it was more influenced by the urdour and genius of the Pontiff. The methods by which he proposed to effectuate his design contained nothing that was impracticable—much that was reasonable and generous. An army of 50,000 or 60,000 confederates was to be immediately collected for the defence of Hungary and the adjacent provinces; the men were to be raised in Germany, Bohemia, Poland, and Hungary. The pecuniary means were to be furnished chiefly by Italy; the clergy* were to contribute a tenth of all their property, the Jews a twentieth, and the laity a thirtieth part. The Pope professed his readiness to conduct the war in person, and to consecrate to that purpose all that belonged to him.

The Council was then dissolved; and whatsoever may have been the sincerity of its members, while they were awed by the presence of the Pontiff, and animated by his eloquence, the engagements they contracted were, for the most part, violated. The intestine dissensions of the Christian Powers were too deeply seated to permit any cordial or general co-operation; and so far was Pius II. from succeeding in his attempt to

* The Venetians and Genoese were not included in this engagement. The greatest difficulties were raised by the former, partly owing to their commercial and other intercourse with the Infidel, and partly, perhaps, because they had been accustomed to profit by crusades, not to contribute to them. Again, though the Duke of Burgundy had given some reluctant promises of aid, neither the French, Castilians, nor Portuguese had offered any hopes. 'As to England (said the Pope), we have nothing to expect from that kingdom, on account of the troubles which divide it; nor from Scotland, hidden in the depths of the ocean. Denmark, and Sweden, and Norway, are too distant to send us soldiers, and, content with their fish, they could not send us money, if they would.'

heal them, that he did not himself long escape their contagion, but presently became entangled in the malignant politics of Europe.

In the same year (1460) a solemn embassy from the Princes of the East arrived at Rome: the respect, which could not be claimed for their power, was offered to their titles and pretensions, and to the object of their mission. The *Embassy from the East.* Envoys professed to represent David, Emperor of Trebizond, George, King of Persia, the Sovereigns of the Two Armenias, and many others. They advanced a profusion of hopes and promises—the Turks were to be assailed from the East by a powerful army, through the Hellespont, Thrace, and the Bosphorus; among their allies they numbered Bendis, King of Mingrelia and Arabia, Pancratius, King of the Georgians, Moüic, Marquis of Gorias, Ismael, Lord of Sinope, and some others; it was the object of their mission to inform his Holiness of these preparations, and to render homage to the Vicar of God upon earth. Pius II. applauded their zeal, and accepted their homage; but assuring them that little could be done on his part, unless in conjunction with the Courts of France and Burgundy, he sent them forth to tell their pompous tale beyond the Alps. It may seem needless to add, that this deputation had no result.

The year following, Thomas Palæologus presented himself at Rome, and he was received with a munificence which did honour to the pontifical Court. The Imperial Exile had passed from Corfu to Ancona, and brought to that city the relics of the Apostle St. Andrew. He bestowed the sacred treasure upon the Pope; and accordingly commissioners were appointed, who conducted it with great solemnity to Rome. It was deposited in St. Peter's with every mark of veneration: and though the reader is already familiar with such absurdities; though he has had frequent occasion to deplore the deference to popular superstition which has been paid by very intelligent, and even very pious, ecclesiastics, we may still record another humiliating act, which it was the fate of Pius II. to perform. Catharine of Sienna had died above eighty years before in perfect odour of sanctity; continual miracles, certified by sufficient testimony, had been performed at her tomb; people were anxiously expecting her canonization.* A Duke of Austria and a King of Hungary had successively solicited the Pontiff of the day to do that justice to her extraordinary qualities; but the ceremony had been deferred through the confusion of the Church and the disorders of the Holy See. It was reserved to the genius of Æneas Sylvius at length to perform that office; and one of the most extravagant enthusiasts, that ever dishonoured the profession of Christianity,† was enthroned among the Saints of the Church by one of the most enlightened Prelates who has in any age adorned it.

From being the zealous advocate of the Council of Basle, we have observed Æneas Sylvius defending the usurpations and exalting the majesty of the Roman See. It was thus that he became qualified to occupy it; and the enjoyment of its power and prerogatives was not calculated to revive his ardour for its reformation. To have imposed limits on an authority exercised by himself had been a rare and difficult effort of

* The first recorded Act of Canonization was performed in 993, by John XV., in behalf of Udalrig, Bishop of Augsburg. The right in the first instance was not exclusively vested in the Pope: councils, and even prelates of high rank, were qualified to perform it; till Alexander III. placed this among the more important acts of authority (Causæ Majores) to be executed only by the Pope.—See Mosh. Cent. x., p. ii. ch. iii.

† The exploits of this fanatic fill twenty-four folio pages in the works of St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence.—(Chronicorum, Tertia Pars, p. 692, et seq.)

magnanimity: and so far was Pius II. from harbouring the design, that he seized an early occasion to discourage those liberal principles of Church government, which were entertained by many ecclesiastics, and which had so lately been propagated by himself. During the Council of Mantua, shortly before its dissolution, and at a moment when his influence over its members was probably the greatest, he published a celebrated Bull against all appeals from the Holy See to general Councils. 'An execrable abuse, unheard of in ancient times*', has gained footing in our days, authorized by some, who, acting under a spirit of rebellion rather than sound judgment, presume to appeal from the Pontiff of Rome, Vicar of Jesus Christ, to whom, in the person of St. Peter, it has been said, "Feed my sheep;" and again, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven;" to appeal, I say, from his judgments to a future Council—a practice which every man instructed in law must regard as contrary to the holy canons, and prejudicial to the Christian republic. . . . The Pope then proceeded to paint in vague and glowing expressions the frightful evils occasioned by such appeals; and finally pronounced to be *ipso facto* excommunicated all individuals who might hereafter resort to them, whether their dignity were imperial, royal, or pontifical, as well as all Universities and Colleges, and all others who should promote and counsel them.

This Edict, published in January, 1460, was no unworthy prelude to the

*Recantation of
Pius II.*

most remarkable act of the pontificate of Pius—his public retraction of his early opinions. Not contented to leave others to contrast his actual conduct with his former principles, and both were too notorious to escape such contrast, he boldly stepped forward as his own judge, and published the most unequivocal condemnation of himself. Before his departure for Ancona, in the year 1463, he addressed to the university of Cologne a bull to the following effect:—That being liable to human imperfection, he had said, or written, much which might unquestionably be censured; but that, as he had sinned, like Paul, and persecuted the Church of God through want of sufficient knowledge, so he now imitated the blessed Augustine, who, having fallen into some erroneous expressions, retracted them; that he ingenuously acknowledged his former ignorance, lest what he had written while young should lead to some error prejudicial to the Holy See; for if there were any one whom it peculiarly became to defend and maintain the eminence and glory of the first Throne of the Church, it was assuredly that individual, whom God, in his mercy and goodness, had raised to the dignity of the vicar of Jesus Christ. That, for these reasons, no confidence was due to those of his writings, which offended, in any manner, the authority of the Apostolical See, and established opinions which it did not acknowledge. 'Wherefore (he added) if you find anything contrary to its doctrine, either in my dialogues, or my letters, or any other of my writings,—despise those opinions, reject them, and follow that which I now proclaim to you. Believe me now that I am old, rather than then, when I spoke as a youth; pay more regard to the Sovereign Pontiff than to the individual; reject Æneas—receive Pius. The former name was imposed by my parents—a Gentile name,—and in my infancy: the other I assumed as a Christian in my Apostolate†.' In conclusion, the Pope, anticipating the natural suspicion of ambitious

* '*Execrabilis et pristinis temporibus inauditus*' are the opening words, which give the title to the decree.

† '*Æneam rejicite, Pium recipite*—illud Gentile nomen parentes indidit nascenti; hoc Christianum in Apostolatu suscepi.'

motives as the occasion of his change, took some pains to remove that notion, by recounting the circumstances of his introduction to the council, and recurring to the seductions which misled his tender inexperience. If that change, of which the first indication was so nearly coincident with his personal advancement, had been a change to a wiser, from a rash and inconsiderate opinion; had the adopted principles of the convert been calculated to advance the permanent interests of his See, better than those which he rejected, the historian might have listened with some attention to his assurances of sincerity. But when we have the soundest reasons to convince us, that the counsels of his youth were sage, and provident, and generous, those of his riper years narrow, and at the same time selfish, there is scarcely space to doubt what the motives really were, which determined his apostacy.

In the mean time the Turkish arms were making progress in all quarters, and the tide of war was rapidly descending to the Adriatic.

Italy lay next in its course; and her contentious children seemed, for the moment, disposed to suspend their intestine animosities. The Pope renewed his exertions. *His exertions against the Turks,* 'Life itself (thus he spoke in consistory) must be laid down for the safety of the flock entrusted to us. The Turks are wasting the provinces of Christendom in succession. What expedients remain to us? To oppose arms to their invasions? We have no means to provide them. What then? Shall we exhort the princes to confront and expel them? This has already been attempted in vain: it is in vain that we tell them to go! Perchance they would listen better, if we should say to them—*Come!* This, then, shall be our next experiment: we will march in person against the Turks, and invite the Christian monarchs to follow us; not by words only, but by example also. It may be, when they shall behold their master and father—the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ Jesus—an infirm old man, advancing to the war, they will take up arms through shame, and valiantly defend our holy religion. . . Not that we propose to draw the sword—a task incompatible with our bodily feebleness and sacerdotal character,—but after the example of the Holy Father Moses, who prayed on the mountain, while Israel was fighting with the Amalekites, we shall stand on some lofty galley or mountain's brow, and holding before our eyes the Divine Eucharist, which is our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall implore Him to grant safety and victory to our contending armies*.'

These were not vain expressions; a numerous force was already assembled at Ancona, and the Venetians had at length engaged to furnish maritime succours. The pontiff departed to assume, in person, the conduct of the expedition. He was preceded by the Cardinal of St. Angelo—an old and venerable prelate, remarkable for his zeal against the infidel; he followed at slow journeys, borne in a litter, and debilitated by sickness; and on his arrival at the camp, he was received by a multitude imperfectly armed, without resources, without discipline, and, for the most part, without enthusiasm. Such were the champions of the Cross; such the human instruments, to which the care of Christendom seemed at that moment to be confided! Many of them Pius immediately dismissed with his pontifical benediction, and a profusion of indulgences, which they no longer affected to value. Those who remained he still proposed to lead against the enemy, and only awaited the *and Death.* arrival of the Venetian galleys. They arrived; but scarcely

* Raynaldus, ann. 1463, sect. 25.

were their white sails visible from the towers of Ancona, when the Pope expired. On this event the whole expedition immediately dispersed; and it seemed as if so many spectators had assembled, from such various and distant regions, for no other purpose than to witness the death of their chief, and swell his funeral procession.

The treasure which was found in his chest was sent, by his express command, to Corvinus, king of Hungary; but it bore no proportion to the sums which had been placed at his disposal for crusading purposes; and there was reason to believe that much had been diverted by the pontiff for the establishment of Ferdinand on the throne of Naples. And thus Pope Pius II., who was fortunate in many circumstances of his life, may not have been least happy in the moment of his departure; at least, it is manifest that he had engaged with very slender resources, and little promise of support, in a dangerous enterprise, which could scarcely have terminated otherwise than in defeat and dishonour.

Nevertheless, Pius II. was the most accomplished, the most liberal, perhaps the most enlightened, individual of his time. Like Nicholas V., he obtained his ecclesiastical advancement by his literary powers, by the acquisition of learning, and the useful application of it. Like Cardinal Julian, he was entrusted with the conduct of difficult negotiations; he influenced the councils of courts; he swayed the deliberations of ecclesiastical assemblies. Like both those eminent churchmen, he displayed unremitting zeal for the defence of Christendom against the Turkish aggression. And herein he imitated the merit of the former, that it was his strenuous exertion in this cause, which gave the colour and character to his pontificate; and in one respect he accomplished, in some manner, the destiny of the latter, that he died in the heart of a Christian camp; prepared to move, under his own personal direction, in a hopeless enterprise, against the armies of the Infidel.

It was now so common for the cardinals, while in conclave, to bind themselves to the observance of certain stipulations, in case of election to the pontificate, and so invariable for the cardinal elected to violate his engagement, that we have ceased to notice acts of habitual—it might almost seem authorized—perjury. But the articles which were imposed

Conditions imposed in Conclave.

by the college, on the death of Pius II., were such as to require attention, from their own importance. The following were, in substance, the principal:—‘That the pope shall continue the war with the Turks, re-establish the ancient discipline of the Roman Court, and assemble a Council General within three years. That he shall not augment the number of cardinals to more than twenty-four, nor create any one who is less than thirty years of age, or deficient in the knowledge of civil and canon law and of the Holy Scriptures; nor more than one from among his own relatives. That he shall condemn no cardinal, except according to the legal and canonical forms; that he shall enter into no war, nor sign any treaty without the consent of the college; that he shall leave to the subjects of the Roman court entire liberty to make their wills; that he shall establish no new imposts, nor increase those existing; that he shall take the votes of the cardinals aloud, and not in a whisper, so that the result of their deliberations may be faithfully expressed; and lastly, that the cardinals shall assemble twice a year, apart from the Pope, to examine whether these conditions have been observed.’

From these stipulations we perceive, that it was no light or lenient yoke to which the courtiers of Rome, with all their outward show and pomp of

licentiousness, were, in fact, subjected; and if they had indeed acquired the efficacy of laws, the constitution of the Vatican would have undergone an entire change,—from a slightly limited despotism, it would have assumed much more of the oligarchical character. It may be questioned, whether the Catholic Church would have gained any advantage by that alteration—whether the dominion of the Sacred College would not have been at least as oppressive, as despotic, as fruitful in abuses, as hostile to reformation, as that of the Pope. But the experiment was not made; the oath was indeed administered with great solemnity, and accepted by all. One among those who had taken it (the cardinal of St. Marc) was immediately raised to the pontificate; and his first official act was to confirm his obligation. But Paul II. (he assumed *Paul II.* that name), alike imperious and vain, pompous and frivolous, was not so constituted, as to sacrifice any interest to the sanctity of any engagement. He presently expressed his contempt for the laws imposed by the conclave; he enacted others on his own authority; he demanded the approbation of the cardinals, and after a very feeble resistance, partly by menaces, partly by promises, partly by granting them some childish indulgences*, he obtained it. He then proceeded to administer the Church, according to the established maxims of government†.

Paul II. was a native of Venice, and his election was, in some measure, occasioned by that circumstance; for it was manifest, that no Italian confederation could act with any vigour against the Turkish power, unless Venice should place herself at its head; and it was hoped that her co-operation would be effectually secured by the choice of a Venetian pontiff. Italy was now at peace; the impulse towards the East had been given by Pius II., and all circumstances seemed favourable to the enterprise. Much unquestionably depended, at that moment, on the character and policy of the Pope. Now the measures taken by Paul II., during his whole pontificate, were precisely those which a council of Mahometans assembled at Constantinople would have dictated. He began his reign by a nefarious attempt to embroil the states of Italy in civil confusion. He failed; and then he engaged in a different project, which has made him more hateful, because it was, for the moment, more successful. Corvinus, the son of Huniades, was defending the frontiers of Christendom with courage and honour. He had gained several advantages over the enemy, which he might with efficient succours have converted into substantial triumphs. Let us mark the policy of Paul II. Thirsting, as it would seem, for *Christian* blood, that Pope proposed to divert the war from the Turks, and turn it against the Hussites. He professed a Catholic ardour to punish the priests who fostered those errors, to reduce the rebels to obedience to the Apostolical See, and to extirpate every heresy. Accordingly, he offered to Corvinus the crown of Bohemia on those terms,

His abominable Policy.

* He permitted them to wear mitres of silk, such as had hitherto been confined to the pontiffs alone; he forbade their use to all other prelates. He likewise allowed them to adorn their horses and mules with trappings of a scarlet colour.

† One of his first acts was, to dismiss from their offices all the *abbreviators* appointed by his predecessor. The biographer Platina was one of them. And when he remonstrated with the pontiff, and threatened to bring the case before the judges of the *Rota*, Paul regarded him fiercely, and said,—‘*Nos ad iudices revocas? Ac si rescires omnia jura in scrinio pectoris nostri collocata esse? Sic stat sententia. Loco cedant omnes; eant quo volunt; nihil eos moror; pontifex sum; mihi que licet arbitrio animi aliorum acta et rescindere et approbare.*’ Platina, notwithstanding, was contumacious, and the Pope placed him, for some months, in rigorous confinement. See his Life of Paul II.

and the boon was accepted. For the space of seven infamous years, those arms, which might have chastised the foreign aggressor, were fiercely directed against the kings of Bohemia; and it is no alleviation of the pontiff's guilt, that those reiterated efforts were finally defeated. While he pursued the principles of Innocent III., his conduct was even less pardonable, because he pursued them under circumstances of greater danger to Christendom, and in an age in which the increase of knowledge left less excuse for crime.

If it was the object of this pontiff to make his internal government as detestable as his external policy, he took an effectual measure to accomplish it. We have observed with what ardour the taste for polite learning was cultivated in Italy at this time, and what great encouragement it had received from two recent pontiffs. In furtherance of those objects a literary society was formed at Rome during the reign of Paul II. But Paul affected to discover in that institution a dangerous conspiracy against the safety of the Pope and the peace of the Church. The stupid jealousy, which suggested that suspicion, was supported by the cruelty usually inherent in narrow and passionate minds; and, as if the blood of the Bohemians flowed in too scanty profusion, the Pope commenced the work of inquisition at Rome. Several innocent individuals, of great literary* and moral reputation, suffered on the rack; one in particular, Agostino Campino, died under the torture. Paul persevered in his persecution, but he did not succeed in eliciting any confession, or discovering any shadow of heresy or conspiracy, in excuse for so much barbarity; nor did it produce any other result, than to create one additional motive for execrating his name. He died in 1471, in possession of treasures which he had hoarded through the mere love of gold; and in the very year preceding his death, he increased an ecclesiastical abuse (in the belief, no doubt, that he should personally reap the fruits of his change†), by reducing once more the intervals between the celebrations of the Jubilee, from thirty-three to twenty-five years.

Sixtus IV. (a Franciscan Monk) commenced an unusually long pontificate, of thirteen years, by professing the policy and affecting *Sixtus IV.* the designs of Pius II. He called for the enforcement of the decrees of Mantua; he promised indulgences to all who should march against the Turk in person, or find efficient substitutes, or contribute to the expense of the expedition; he sent letters and legates to all the Courts of Europe. All disregarded his solicitations, some through apathy, others, perhaps, through suspiciousness; others through the nearer occupation of civil dissension. The Pope was easily diverted from an object on which he may have never been sincerely bent. His boiling zeal presently evaporated; his clamours were silenced by the first repulse; and he appeared to resign his daring projects, and subside into the ordinary channel of papal misgovernment, without a sigh or a struggle.

In the year 1478, during some disturbances between the Medici and the Pazzi at Florence, the Archbishop of Pisa suffered an *His dispute with* ignominious death at the hands of the former. There *Florence.* is little doubt, that he had promoted a sanguinary tumult—nevertheless, this was an outrage upon the

* A long account of this affair is given by Platina (himself a sufferer) in his *Life of Paul II.* That Pope's hatred for learning was so great, that he held the terms *studious* and *heretical* to be synonymous, and carefully impressed upon his subjects the advantages of ignorance. The historian died in the year 1481.

† Thus the year 1475 became a year of jubilee.

prerogative of the hierarchy, which, in an earlier age, would have been visited with signal vengeance, and which even Sixtus IV. was not prepared to overlook. He placed the offending city under an interdict, excommunicated Lorenzo de' Medici *, and published a declaration of war. The Florentines, even the ecclesiastics, defended the cause of their compatriot; they treated with scorn the pontifical menaces; they continued to celebrate the divine offices in defiance of the interdict; they assembled a Synod of the Bishops of Tuscany, in order to appeal with greater solemnity to a General Council. At the same time they retorted all the blame of the original offence upon the Pope himself, and called upon France and Milan to aid them against his oppression.

Soon afterwards Louis XI. held an Assembly at Orleans, principally for the purpose of restoring the Pragmatic Sanction, which he had previously and hastily annulled. But an embassy, subsequently sent to Rome, was likewise charged to exhort the Pontiff to make peace with Florence, and to assemble, without any delay, a General Council. These solicitations were seconded by certain menaces, to which Louis could have given efficacy, had he so chosen. But he had either no serious intention of enforcing his demands, or he allowed it to melt away before the temporizing policy of the Vatican †. In the mean time the Pope persevered in measures of hostility, and the blood of the Archbishop cried so loudly for vengeance, that all external dangers were forgotten, and the hosts of Mahomet II. approached unheard to the gates of Italy. The same Pontiff who had so lately preached the blessings of union to the Christian Courts, even while the danger was more remote, persisted in hostility against a Christian State, when it was already impending over his head. At length he relented; but it was not till the city of Otranto had been stormed by the Infidel that the conditions of peace were dictated ‡, and the Florentine ambassadors admitted to receive their absolutions at the entrance of St. Peter's; and even then they appear to have been subjected to more than the customary circumstances of humiliation. The Pope was presently relieved from immediate apprehension by the death of Mahomet, and he then had leisure to return to what had been, indeed, the favourite object of his pontificate, the aggrandizement of his nephews.

The nepotism of no former Pontiff had been indulged with so scandalous a sacrifice of the interests of the Church as that of Sixtus IV. One of his nephews, Leonardo della Rovera, *His Nepotism*, he married to a natural daughter of Ferdinand of Naples; and on this occasion he abandoned to that monarch some estates and fiefs, which his predecessors had spared no toil to acquire and retain. Another, named Julian, the same who was afterwards Julius II., was enriched with several ecclesiastical benefices. For a third, named Jerome Riario, the principality of Imola was purchased

* The Bull is given at length by Roscoe, *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici*. Appendix, No. XXVI.

† The advice tendered to the Pope on this occasion by the Cardinal of Pavia, the most accomplished politician in his Court, affords an excellent illustration of the great principle of ecclesiastical statesmanship—*not* to remove the grounds of complaint; but to gain time, to preserve the abuse, to *defer* the hour of danger, rather than avert it altogether by timely concession.

‡ This scene is described at length by Machiavel, *Stor. Fiorent.*, lib. viii. The particulars of the dispute are detailed by Paul Jovius, in his *First Book of his Life of Leo X.* This connexion of Pope Sixtus with the history of Florence has procured for him a peculiar, and not very enviable, celebrity. 'Di grossi conti (says Muratori, *Annal.* v. 9) avrà avuto questo Pontefice nel tribunale di Dio.'

from the resources of the Apostolical Treasury. But it was on Pietro Riario, the youngest, that the profusion of his fondness was principally lavished. Without talents, without virtues, from a simple Franciscan Monk, Pietro was immediately elevated to the dignity of Cardinal. He was made titular Patriarch of Constantinople; he was raised to the Archiepiscopal See of Florence; he received, besides, two other Archbishoprics, and a multitude of inferior benefices. In the mean time his splendid prodigality, the pride of his attendants, his equipage, and his sumptuousness, kept pace with the abundance of his resources, and he expended on the pomp of a single ceremony, or the festivities of a single night, sums which exceeded the revenues of kings.

The same Pope, as if to atone for the laxity of one extreme of the ecclesiastical establishment by the austerity of the other, *The Minimes.* gave his confirmation to a new religious body, called the Minimes—the least among the servants of Christ. They were founded by one Francisco of Paula; and to the usual monastic obligations they added a fourth vow, of perpetual fast and abstinence from all nourishment, except herbs and roots. The popular appetite for such extravagance was not yet wholly satiated; and though the Minimes never acquired the celebrity which would certainly have attended them in the thirteenth age, there were still not wanting devotees to swell their numbers, and recompense their vain enthusiasm by reverence and by gold.

When we shall come to examine the spiritual condition of the Roman Catholic Church during this period, and the character of the papal edicts which were more particularly directed to that object, we shall find that no one descended more deeply into superstition than Sixtus IV. At present we shall only mention the singular venality introduced into his government by the creation of certain new offices, which he publicly sold, and which he created for the purpose of selling. This was a new scandal in the history of the Vatican; and when the same Pontiff raised to the dignity of Cardinal a youth, named Jacopo di Parma, his own valet, he may seem to have offered the last insult to his Court and his Church. The deeper outrage, which was now continually cast upon the religion of Christ, has almost ceased to be matter of mention with us, because the name of Christ was now seldom appealed to, unless in support of some monstrous ecclesiastical pretension; and the rulers of the Apostolical Church had for some time learned to dispense, both in their morals and their administration, even with the semblance of holiness, even with a decorous affectation of religious motives.

Sixtus IV. was not deficient, as a political character, in quickness and sagacity, and even grandeur of conception. But his character *Character* (as Sismondi has well observed) corrupted his talents, and *of Sixtus.* stained his noblest projects with falsehood and perfidy. As he could discern no distinction between virtue and crime, he employed the basest means to attain the best ends, and dishonoured his own designs by the instruments with which he chose to accomplish them. His private life has not escaped the suspicion of the foulest enormities—it cannot, at least, pretend to the praise of piety or innocence. His learning, the exertions which he made, and the funds which he appropriated to enrich the Library of the Vatican from every quarter; his architectural labours, and the noble buildings * with which he adorned his capital;

* The *Ponte Sesto* was his great work. His literary monuments were of a less durable construction; for, indeed, the subjects which he chose were not always the most favourable

these are the only monuments by which he is honourably known to posterity. His capacity was considerable, and it was enlarged and enlivened by his literary accomplishments. But if these were unable to infuse into his soul any disinterested virtue, or generous principles of action, they failed to accomplish the only purpose, for which they are really valuable, and they left the possessor the more dangerous and the more detestable, from the authority which they added to his talents, and the aid which they lent him to abuse them.

Sixtus IV. died in 1484, and the election of his successor was attended by some circumstances more scandalous than any which had yet polluted the recesses of the Conclave. Julian *Election of Innocent VIII.* della Rovera, Cardinal of St. Peter *ad Vincula*, had undertaken the negotiations requisite, and the price of every vote was already arranged, when the College proceeded to invoke the Holy Spirit. The terms are expressly specified by a contemporary writer*; they were faithfully observed by the successful candidate; and they might be ascertained from the various castles and benefices, which he immediately bestowed on his supporters. John Baptist Cybo, a native of Genoa, was the individual thus elevated to the throne of the Church, and he assumed the name of Innocent.

Notwithstanding the recent perfidy of Paul II., defended by the constitution of Innocent VI.†, and countenanced by the example of so many Pontiffs, the members of the Conclave once more attempted to bind the future Pope by a similar engagement. It were tedious to repeat the stipulations which were accepted in the name of God, on his holy altar, and which were even then intended for immediate violation. Their object was ever the same—to increase the power of the Cardinals at the expense of that of the Pope—and it was ever frustrated by the most deliberate perjury. On the day of his installation, Innocent VIII. confirmed and repeated his oath, and bound himself, on pain of anathema, neither to receive nor give absolution from it—for the Pontiff possessed exclusively the power of self-absolution. Howbeit, he no sooner felt his strength, and the independence of his despotism, than he cancelled the treaty, and annulled both his oaths.

If Sixtus IV. had wasted the resources of the Church upon his profligate nephews, Innocent introduced a still more revolting race of dependants, in the persons of his illegitimate offspring. Seven children, the fruits of various amours, were publicly recognized by the Vicar of Christ, and became, for the most part, pensioners on the ecclesiastical Treasury. This was yet a new scandal for the Apostolical Church! Again, if Sixtus IV. was bold and unprincipled, Innocent was, at least, destitute of any positive virtue; and the extreme weakness which distinguished him was, in his circumstances, little less pernicious than wickedness. With power so vast and arbitrary, in a Court so utterly depraved, the personal excesses of a vigorous character might even have been less hurtful to the Church, than the unrestrained licence of so many masters. Fewer crimes would, perhaps, have been perpetrated, had the Pontiff resolved to be the only criminal. But with all his weakness, Innocent

to their perpetuity. One treatise he composed on The Blood of Jesus Christ; another on Indulgences accorded to Souls in Purgatory; another on the Conception of the Holy Virgin, &c. &c. Such, however, were the controversies of the day.

* The letter of Guidantonio Vespucci to Lorenzo de' Medici on this subject, is given entire by Roscoe, Append. 44, and without suspicion of its truth.

† Published in 1353. See Chapter XXII. p. 489.

was animated by a spirit of avarice, which attracted observation even in that age of the popedom. And he performed at least one memorable exploit, as it were, in the design to surpass his predecessor by a still bolder insult on the sacred College; he placed among its members a boy, thirteen years old, the brother-in-law of his own bastard*. But the Court of Rome did not resent the indignity—it was sunk even below the sense of its own infamy.

The Pontiff sounded, like most of his predecessors, the trumpet of a general crusade against the Infidel; in his addresses to the European ambassadors, he set forth, in eloquent expressions, the blessings of concord, and the calamities of international warfare; and he preached with the usual inefficacy. Some Italian States did, indeed, exhibit a slight disposition to support him, owing to the greater proximity of the danger, and Innocent persisted, to the end of his reign, in pressing his first solicitations. But the only effects proceeding from them were those which flowed into the Apostolical Treasury, and which the Pope consumed, partly in his own personal expenses, partly in family hostilities against the King of Naples. He died in 1492.

In the downward progress of pontifical impurity, from Paul II. we descend to Sixtus IV.; from Sixtus to Innocent VIII.; *Alexander II.* from Innocent to Alexander VI: and here, at length, we are arrested by the limits, the utmost limits, which have been assigned to papal and to human depravity. The ecclesiastical records of fifteen centuries, through which our long journey is now nearly ended, contain no name so loathsome, no crimes so foul as his; and while the voice of every impartial writer is loud in his execration, he is, in one respect, singularly consigned to infamy, since not one among the zealous annalists of the Roman Church has breathed a whisper in his praise. Thus, those who have pursued him with the most unqualified vituperations are thought to have described him most faithfully; and the mention of his character has excited a sort of rivalry in the expression of indignation and hatred.

The College assembled for this election amidst the tumults of the Roman people, who were venting their curses against the avarice of the deceased Pontiff; and it was not till the Conclave had been garrisoned by soldiers, and fortified by cannon, that the Cardinals ventured to proceed to their deliberations. It was presently discovered that the candidates, who had any prospect of success, were two† only. One of them was Roderic Borgia, who was nephew of Calixtus III.; the other was Julian della Rovera, nephew of Sixtus IV. Nepotism now formed so conspicuous a feature in the pontifical policy, that we shall not be surprised to see the popedom disputed by the nephews of Popes. Roderic was far advanced in years; he abounded in wealth, accumulated in the service of the Church; he was, at the same time, in the enjoyment of three archbishoprics in Spain, besides numerous other benefices in other quarters of Europe. All these would be vacated by his elevation, and, falling into his patronage, would be bestowed, of course, according to the measure of private services. Borgia was, moreover, a man of some abilities, of great address

* This boy was John, the son of Lorenzo de' Medici, the same who became Leo X. It should be observed, that Innocent, on making the creation, stipulated that the boy should not take his seat in Consistory till he was sixteen. Some state the age of creation at fifteen, that of admission at eighteen. See Raynaldus, ann. 1489.

† Ascagna Sforza, who appeared at first to possess some claims, very soon resigned them in favour of Borgia.

and versatility in negotiation and intrigue, and of morals which opposed no impediment to any means of compassing any purpose. . . . Julian possessed more powerful talents, and, though his habits had been chiefly military, a much less exceptionable character. But he was younger; his preferment was not nearly so valuable, and the private wealth at his disposal bore no proportion to that of his competitor. The College was principally composed of the creatures of the two last Popes, Sixtus and Innocent, educated in those principles, on which the morals of the Roman Court were at this time founded. . . . Accordingly the election was not long doubtful; indeed, Borgia had taken a sure precaution to preclude hesitation, by placing two mules laden with gold* at the disposal of a faithful Cardinal, to be bestowed as occasion might require.

Alexander VI. immediately proceeded, after the example of his predecessor, to fulfil the conditions privately stipulated with the cardinals, who had simoniacally elected him. On *Manner of his* Ascagna Sforza he conferred the profitable dignity of vice- *election.* chancellor; to Cardinal Orsini he ceded his palace at Rome, together with two other mansions; to Cardinal Colonna he gave an abbey, with numerous dependencies; to the cardinal of St. Angelo, the bishopric of Porto, together with his furniture and a cellar of delicious wines; to others, churches or towns; to others, undisguised gold. Five only in the whole college—one of whom was Julian, his rival—are believed to have resisted all these varieties of corruption. In the mean time, the Roman people, as if they gloried in the iniquity of their rulers, hailed the decision of the Conclave with unusual expressions of satisfaction. On no other occasion had the holy city arrayed herself in such festive splendour, or descended to such loathsomeness of adulation †, as on that, when she placed in the apostolical chair the most profligate of mankind, and offered the last insult—we say not to the name of Christ, for *that* had long been scorned,—but to a Church which still called itself Christian, and to the nations which still recognized that Church.

In early life, during the pontificate of Pius II., Roderic Borgia, already a cardinal, had been stigmatized by a public censure for his unmuffled debaucheries. Afterwards he publicly cohabited with a Roman matron named Vanozia, by whom he had five acknowledged children. Neither in his manners nor in his language did he affect any regard for morality or for decency; and one of the earliest acts of his pontificate was, to celebrate, with scandalous magnificence, in his own palace, the marriage of his daughter Lucretia. Those cardinals, who had conspired for his elevation, could not pretend either surprise or offence at this outrage. But Julian della Rovera refused his countenance to those festivities, and shut himself up in the fortress of Ostia.

* Some say, four mules laden with silver. The difference, in a moral point of view, is not important.

† The following distich was published on this occasion:—

Cæsare magna fuit, nunc Roma est maxima; Sextus
Regnat Alexander: ille vir, iste Deus.

This was the serious flattery of the day: some other verses, published after some little experience of the Pope's *divine* administration, are less discreditable to the city of Cæsar and Pasquin.

Vendit Alexander Claves, Altaria, Christum.
Emerat ille prius: vendere jure potest.
De vitio in vitium, de flammâ transit in ignem;
Roma sub Hispano deperit imperio.
Sextus Tarquinius, Sextus Nero, Sextus et iste—
Semper sub Sextis perditâ Roma fuit.

At this period in the annals of papacy, the spiritual exertions of the See were so very insignificant, compared with its struggles for temporal objects, and these struggles were now so interwoven with the general politics of Europe, that to trace, with any accuracy, the exploits of Alexander, or Julius II., would be to transcribe the civil history of Italy, France, and Germany. Such a task is consistent neither with the limits of this work, nor its design; and since the various vices, which peculiarly distinguished this Pope, are chiefly exemplified in his political transactions, we must refer the reader to the circumstantial narratives of Sismondi, or Guicciardini*—contented in our more contracted course to mention such incidents, as are more closely connected either with the religion of Christ, or the economy of the Church, or the pretensions of the Apostolical See. Thus shall we not pass unnoticed the celebrated project of alliance against

Negotiations with Bajazet. Charles VIII. of France, which was proposed by Alexander VI. to Bajazet, emperor of the Turks. The Pope appeared, on this occasion, as the Suzerain Lord of Naples; and in his overtures he represented to the Sultan,

that that kingdom was menaced by foreign invasion; that it was the design of Charles to subject it to his authority, and then to turn his arms into Thrace, against the walls of Constantinople; that the French king was full of ambition, and careless about the means of indulging it; while for himself he had nothing more at heart, than the repose of the Turk, in consideration of the good-will and mutual friendship subsisting between them. . . . The nature of the engagements, into which Bajazet consequently entered, does not certainly appear, but when the crisis arrived, he took no measures to fulfil them; and the Vicar of Christ, after having invoked the Mahometan arms into the heart of Europe against a Christian prince, was pursued by the additional, and to him more bitter, reflexion, that he had incurred that infamy in vain.

Donation of the newly discovered Regions. On the return of Columbus to Spain, Ferdinand and Isabella announced to the Pope, their compatriot, the success of his expedition. Alexander VI. hastened to avail himself of so magnificent an occasion to exhibit the plenitude of his authority: accordingly, he conferred upon the crown of

Castile the full right to possess all that had been discovered, and all that might hereafter be discovered, whether islands or continents, whether situated in the Indies or in any other region. In a succession of bulls published on this subject, in the year 1493, at a season when the power of the See bore no proportion to its ancient grandeur, and when the character of the prelates, who administered it, was not, certainly, such as to redeem its degradation, Pope Alexander drew a line along the map, from the north to the south, and gave away, by a stroke of his pen, half the habitable world. And so much seriousness did he affect to attach to his donation, that he descended to specify the exact distance from his line, at which the rights of Spain should begin, and those of other nations end.

* We shall cite the words in which this author has drawn the character of Alexander VI.

‘ In Alessandro Sesto fù solerzia e sagacità singolare, consiglio eccellente, efficacia a persuadere maravigliosa, e a tutte le faccende gravi sollecitudine e destrezza incredibile—ma erano queste virtù avanzate di grande intervallo da’ vizii—costumi oscenissimi, non sincerità, non vergogna, non verità, non fede, non religione, avarizia insaziabile, ambizione immoderata, crudeltà più che barbara, e ardentissima cupidità di esaltare in qualunque modo i figliuoli, i quali erano molti; e tra questi qualcuno. . . meno detestabile in parte alcuna del padre.’ Storia d’ Italia, lib. i. Guicciardini was ten years old when Borgia was raised to the pontificate, and his history begins with that year.

It is proper to add, that the Portuguese contested the validity of the act. Let us inquire, then, on what ground did they rest their opposition? Did they dispute the authority by which the edict had been issued? Far otherwise; only they maintained that, by a similar act, Eugenius IV. had previously bestowed the same rights upon themselves. It was no contest between the king of Portugal and the See of Rome, but only a question, whether a Pope could confer upon one prince, what a preceding Pope had already bestowed upon another. And in this dispute, between a living and a departed pontiff, after many assemblies had been held, and new boundaries delineated, and great violence displayed, Alexander persisted, and succeeded, in defiance of every right and every semblance even of pontifical justice. In the year following, Africa became the subject of a very similar dispute; but on this occasion the Pope showed thus much respect to the authority of Pius II., who had conferred the contested provinces upon Portugal, that he confined the conquests of Ferdinand and Isabella to the kingdoms of Algiers and Tunis, leaving Fez and the contiguous regions to the possession of Portugal. We may smile at the arrogance of a declining despotism; nor shall we be astonished by the obsequiousness of those who found their interest in obsequiousness. At the same time, if the right of the See was not disputed, the motives which it pretended were certainly such as to justify the exercise of its right. For it was expressly stipulated in the act of donation, that holy and pious missionaries should be despatched forthwith, for the conversion of the newly conquered tracts, and the extension of the kingdom of Christ, and of the Catholic Church.

When Charles VIII. entered Rome, in the year 1494, Julian della Rovera (as well as some other cardinals) was in his suite, and shared in his counsels*. From the de- *Charles VIII.*
 termined hostility of Julian; from the wish for reform- *at Rome.*
 ation, which had so often been manifested by the court and people of France; from the undue estimate then formed of the character of the actual king, Alexander felt reason to apprehend the accomplishment of the menace so frequently repeated,—the assembly of a general council; and he easily foresaw, that the first act of that council would be, to depose himself. From the castle of St. Angelo he opened negotiations with the conqueror; but, whether it had never been the intention of Charles to press the Holy See to any extremities, or whether, as is believed by the best writers, Alexander found means to corrupt the most intimate advisers of the king by largesses and promises, the designs of Julian were frustrated, and the dignity of the Pope was preserved by a favourable convention. He returned to the pontifical palace; he resumed his former state; he gave the king a formal reception at St. Peter's, with the usual solemnities; and the king did not disdain to submit to the usual humiliation. He bent his knees, and kissed the pontiff's foot and hand; and, subsequently, on the celebration of the pontifical mass, took his seat below the first cardinal, and ministered water to the hands of the Pope†. Such were the marks of deference which had long

* Guicciardini (lib. i. cap. iii.) does not hesitate to ascribe the accomplishment of Charles's designs against Italy to this Cardinal—*'fatale instrumento è allora, è prima, è poi [de'mali d'Italia.]'*—The King at one moment certainly relaxed in his zeal, and was reanimated by the authority and vehemence of Julian.

† Guicciardini mentions, that the Pope, to preserve the memory of these ceremonies to all posterity, caused them to be represented in painting, in one of the chambers of the castle of St. Angelo. It is to be remarked, that they were the formal ceremonies following

been exacted by Popes, and paid by Sovereigns; but never, till now, had they been prostituted so gratuitously—never, till now, had they been tendered in the place of chastisement and infamy, by a powerful and victorious prince, to a pontiff as destitute of strength, as he was notoriously polluted with crimes.

There was one article in the above treaty which leads to the mention of a singular episode in papal history. The Sultan *Bajazet the brother* of *Bajazet*. *the son of Mahomet II.,* whose popularity, courage, and ambition, made him dangerous to the throne. The morals of the Seraglio permitted the destruction of such rivals; and *Zizim*, fearing that fate, had escaped to Rhodes, and placed himself in Christian hands. From Rhodes he was carried to France, and thence he passed into the custody of Pope Innocent VIII. It was then that *Bajazet*, availing himself of the avarice of the vicars of Christ as the means of preserving the concord of an empire hostile to the Christian faith, engaged to pay to the See a yearly sum of forty thousand ducats—nominally, for the keeping and entertainment of his brother; really, to make it the interest of the Vatican to secure the prisoner at Rome, and not to resign him to any enemy of the empire*. The money was faithfully paid, and *Zizim* remained a safe and profitable captive at the apostolical court. Charles VIII., who seems at that time to have really harboured some ulterior designs against the Turkish power, stipulated with Alexander for the possession of *Zizim*. The pontiff observed his engagement; but the prisoner carried with him from his confinement the seeds of a mortal disorder. He died very soon afterwards; and there seems some reason to believe, that the cause of his death was a slow and subtle poison administered under the superintendence of Alexander†.

Cæsar Borgia was the second, and favourite, and worthy son of Alexander VI. He commenced his career as a Churchman; but in 1498, he found it more politic at once to throw off that profession; and he then received the title, which he has rendered one of the most famous in history. As *Duke Valentino*, or *Valentinois*, he took the field in Romagna, the temporal champion of the Holy See, for the destruction of its enemies, the confirmation of its authority over the city, and the enlargement of its territories. Supported by the talents and resources of his father, he succeeded in these designs to an extent attained in no preceding age, and by means which are known to every reader. But, in seeking thus to advance the interests of the Church, Alexander had, in truth, no other design than to aggrandize his son; nor did *Valentino* toil through such a mass of crimes with any more distant object, than to erect a principality for himself‡. To this end he had calculated, as seemed to him, every

the reconciliation of the parties. On their first meeting, which was not thoroughly official, some of the most humiliating were dispensed with. The ‘*Capitula Conventionis Papæ et Regis Franciæ, &c.*’ are cited from the ‘*Diary of Burchard*,’ by Roscoe, *Life of Leo X.*, Appendix, No. xxxv.

* Guicciard., lib. i. cap. iii.

† Of course this fact is not, nor could it well have been, undisputed. Raynaldus (ann. 1495, s. 8, &c.) refers to Burchardus to prove that the captive died from a change of diet. The words of Burchardus are—‘15 Feburrier, le fils du grand Turc mourut a Naples—ex esu sive potu non convenienti naturæ suæ et consueto —’ At the same time, Raynaldus mentions the vulgar account, which is affirmed by Guicciardini. See Roscoe, *Life of Leo X.*, chap. iv.

‡ “Yet what he did (says Machiavel) turned to the Church’s advantage; which, after

possible contingency; by much daring, great address, and an entire contempt of every scruple, of all faith, and of all shame, he had already accomplished much: and, to secure the stability of his power, he had employed every expedient within the reach of human foresight—when the realization of his schemes was put to an unexpected trial, by the death of his father, and his own dangerous sickness.

The following are the circumstances relating to the death of Alexander, which stand on the most extensive evidence:—The Duke Valentino, being greatly in want of money to pay his troops, applied to his father for assistance; but the apostolical treasury was exhausted, and neither resources nor credit were then at hand to replenish it. On which the duke suggested to the Pope an easy, and, as it would seem, not very unusual method of supplying their wants. The Cardinal Corneto, as well as some others of the sacred college, had a great reputation for wealth; and it was then the practice at Rome for the property of cardinals to devolve, on their decease, to the See. He proposed to get rid of this Corneto. The Pope consented; and, accordingly, invited the cardinals to an entertainment, which he prepared for them in his vineyard of Corneto, for it was near the Vatican. Among the wines sent for this occasion, one bottle was prepared with poison; and instructions were carefully given to the superintendant of the feast respecting the disposal of that bottle. It happened that, some little time before supper, the Pope and his son arrived, and, as it was very hot, they called for wine. And then, whether through the error or the absence of the confidential officer, the poisoned bottle was presented to them. Both drank of it, and both immediately suffered its violent effects. Valentino, who had mixed much water with his wine, and was, besides, young and vigorous, through the immediate use of powerful antidotes*, was saved. But Alexander having taken his draught nearly

*Death of
Alexander VI.*

the death of the Pope, and the removal of the Duke, became 'the heir of all his pains.' The partiality of this writer to the *public* character of the Duke (with whom he was personally acquainted) is known to every one. Yet there is a passage (in the Prince, chap. vii.) which is worth citing. 'Having thus collected all the Duke's actions, methinks I could not well blame him, but rather set him as a pattern to be followed by all those who, by profane and other means, have been exalted to an empire. . . . Whoever, therefore, deems it necessary, on his entrance into a new principality, to secure himself from his enemies, and gain his friends; to overcome, either by force, or by cunning; to make himself beloved or feared of his people; to be followed and revered by his soldiers; to root out those that can hurt him, or owe him any hurt; to change the ancient orders for new ways; to be severe, and yet acceptable, magnanimous, and liberal; to extinguish the unfaithful soldiery, and create new; to maintain to himself the amities of kings and princes, so that they shall either with favour benefit, or be wary how they offend him—cannot find more fresh and lively examples than in the actions of this man.' In a separate narrative, usually published in the same volume, Machiavel relates at length (what is, no doubt, one of those lively examples) the methods which the Duke employed to rid himself of certain enemies—Vitellozzo Vitelli, Oliverotto of Fermo, Paul, and the Duke of Gravina; and a more black and scandalous tissue of perfidy, cruelty, and villany cannot possibly be imagined. That he was the author of the assassination of his elder brother, the Duke of Gandia, is believed by most historians; and that the motive was an incestuous jealousy respecting their common sister is a further imputation advanced by many, and not rejected by Sismondi; but there is no sufficient evidence to establish either of these charges.

* He is said to have been inclosed in the belly of a living mule, and so preserved. . . . The following is the brief account given by Paul Jovius of this transaction, in the beginning of lib. ii., *De Vita Leonis X.* 'Nam Pontifex inopie metu rapax atque illo immani ingenio sevens, ut Cæsari filio magnos alenti exercitus et regio luxu liberalitatem passim ostendenti pecuniam suppeditaret, ditissimum quemque Cardinalium veneno sustulerat, haud dubie in reliquis aulae sacerdotiis atque opibus insignes hereditatis spe seviturus, nisi admirabili deorum providentia homo in religionis causa probrosus et quod omnium fortunæ interfuit, ad exitium Italiæ natus, sibi mortem, supremam vero Cæsari filio cala-

pure, and being likewise enfeebled by age, died in the course of the same evening.

It is proper to add, that there are two other accounts of this transaction, differing from that which is here given on the general agreement of numerous authorities. One is that of Pietro Martiri d'Angleria, a councillor of Ferdinand, of whom an epistle is extant, in which the Pope is exculpated from all participation in the crime, and the whole guilt thrown upon the duke. And this has been received by some writers as the more probable, through consideration of the general hatred then subsisting against Alexander, and the prevalent disposition to propagate and believe any evil rumour respecting him; but we are not aware that it rests on any other original testimony. The other account is extracted by Raynaldus (anu. 1503, sect. xi.), from a manuscript journal of the house of Borgia*; and herein we are entertained by a circumstantial description of the last natural illness of Alexander, the character of the fever, the practice of the physicians, the piety of the departing pontiff, the reverence with which he received the last sacrament, the demeanour of the cardinals and others who were present at the edifying scene. But this family narrative, being at variance with the less partial accounts of the same transaction, may be rejected without much hesitation.

Such, then, was the probable end of Alexander VI.: he was poisoned by the cup prepared for his own guest by his own hand, or, at least, by the hand of a beloved son, whose notorious crimes he had long endured and fostered, and whom he seems to have loved for those very crimes; so that, in respect to his general character, it imports not very much, whether he was an accomplice or not in that last offence, of which he was the deserving victim. 'All Rome (says Guicciardini) rushed to St. Peter's to behold his corpse with incredible festivity; nor was there any man who could satiate his eyes with gazing on the remains of a serpent, which, by his immoderate ambition and pestiferous perfidy, and every manner of frightful cruelty, of monstrous lust and unheard-of avarice, trafficking indiscriminately with things sacred and profane, had poisoned the whole world.' Yet the world still continued to acknowledge the vicegerent of Christ, and to bow before the throne of St. Peter. The cup was not yet full; some few remaining iniquities were still to be accomplished; the arm of vengeance was still suspended, and Luther, the

mitatem, peperisset—hilariori scilicet in cœna dum ad umbrosum Vaticanum fontem venenum bibunt, lagena pocillatoris errore commutata, quam dira fraude opulentis aliquot senatoribus honoris specie paravissent. Mortuo Alexandro, et Cæsare exquisitis antidotis vel in ipso juvenatē robore veneni impetum vix sustinente, Comitatus sunt habita,' &c. &c. The same author describes the same event (De vita Magni Consalvi, lib. ii.) with little variation, but with the following addition:—'Accepi ego ab Adriano Cardinale Cornetano, in cujus villa cœnabatur, se eodem mortifero poculo petiit ita exarsisse eo subito viscerum fervore, ut obortæ caligines oppressis sensibus sibi rationem excuterent, sese in solum frigida plenum mergere cogeretur, neque prius perustis interaneis ad vitam rediisse, quam ei extrema cutis in exuvias abiens toto corpore decideret.' Raphael Volaterranus, in his life of Alexander VI., likewise mentions the illness of the cardinal, simultaneous with that of the Pope. Voltaire disbelieves the whole story, owing to its extreme improbability; while he allows that the father and son were 'les deux plus grands scélérats parmi les puissances de l'Europe.' Is the story, then, so very improbable? But if it were, mere probability is a very faithless test of historical truth. Things contrary to all calculation are happening every day, and have always happened.

* Sismondi likewise refers to the 'Letters of the Ambassador of the House of Este,' and to Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, tom. x. p. 15. According to Guicciardini (lib. vi.), the death of Alexander took place on August 17, 1503,—'e il giorno seguente è portato morto secondo l'uso dei Pontifici inella Chiesa di San Piero, nero, infiato e bruttissimo segni manifestissimi di veleno.'

destined instrument, had not yet commenced his noviciate among the Augustinian Mendicants.

After the funeral honours had been duly paid to the departed pontiff, eight and thirty cardinals entered into Conclave to choose a successor. The unusual number of the electors may *Election and* be one reason why the present election was not charged *Death of Pius III.* with simony; but it presented a scene of treacherous intrigue, scarcely less shameful, in which Julian della Rovera was the principal actor—for as no man was more daring in warfare, so was not any one more astute in duplicity, than he. By the success of his machinations, a sick and feeble old man, the nephew of Pius II., was raised to the pontificate on September 22, 1503; and scarcely had he received the ordination to the priesthood, (which, though a cardinal, he had not previously received,) and undergone the ceremony of coronation, and assumed the name of Pius III., when he died—six and twenty days after his election. Great expectations were excited by his reputed virtues and piety, and his ardently expressed desire for a reformation of the Church; and it may be fortunate for his memory that they were disappointed by his death, rather than by some act of apostacy, by which he might not improbably have imitated so many of his predecessors.

Julian celebrated the mass at his obsequies; and scarcely was that office performed when he re-opened his former intrigues in the design, on this occasion, of procuring his own election. He gained the *Julius II.* leading cardinals; he gained the Duke de Valentinois, who directed the Spanish party in the conclave, by magnificent promises, and the confidence that they would be observed. On the very first scrutiny, Julian della Rovera was unanimously raised to the chair of Alexander VI. We should here mention that, before the election of Pius III., the cardinals in conclave had bound the future Pope, among other conditions, to convoke a council general for the reform of the Church, within two years from the time of his election, and to make the assembly of such councils, hereafter, triennial. It appears that Julian, on his elevation, gave his assent to the same stipulations*.

He took the name of Julius II.; thereby intending, as many suppose, to avow his preference of the military to the sacerdotal character, and to declare his greater disposition to imitate the glories of Pagan, than of Christian, Rome. *His military character.* Assuredly his whole pontificate was directed by such motives; and if the ten years, through which it extended, are not wholly destitute of events properly appertaining to ecclesiastical history, those events did scarcely ever originate with the Pope, and were unconnected with the principles of his government. It was not that he neglected, in the progress of his negotiations and campaigns, to carry on his lips the name of St. Peter, to whet the material upon the spiritual sword, and to thunder forth bulls and anathemas with all the majesty of former days; but it was in this respect only that he was distinguished from the *other* temporal sovereigns, with whom he leagued or contended.

After so long a course of pontifical degeneracy, in the hands of a Pope so absolutely secular as Julius, it might have been expected that those

* The form of the oath deserves to be cited in its very words. 'Præmissa omnia et singula promitto, voveo et juro observare et adimplere, in omnibus et per omnia, purè et simpliciter et bona fide, realiter, et cum effectu perjurii et anathematis, a quibus nec me ipsum absolvam, nec alieni absolutionem committam. Ita me Deus adjuvet, &c.' It appears in Beausobre, Hist. Reform. liv. i.

bolts had lost their force and their terrors; and that the bishop of Rome, having descended to the policy of a secular prince, would have been treated by his brother princes with no superior reverence. Yet was it otherwise; the fetters of the inveterate prejudice were not yet wholly unloosed, and the spiritual weapon was still an object of apprehension even to the king of France. So late as the year 1510, Louis XII.*, being deeply embroiled with the Pope, and struck with the sentence of excommunication, assembled a council of his clergy at Tours, and formally demanded their opinions on such points as these:—‘Whether the Pope had a right to make war, when neither the interests of religion, nor the domains of the Church were in danger? Whether a prince might seize the ecclesiastical states, in case the Pope were his declared enemy, and keep temporary possession of them, until he should have humbled his adversary? Whether, under the same circumstances, a subtraction of obedience, under certain restrictions, were lawful? Whether a prince might defend another prince—his ally—against the pontifical arms?’ Such were the scruples which still were felt even in the court of France. They were removed by the loyalty of the episcopal assembly: nevertheless, even after their removal, enough remained to distinguish the apostolical from all other governments; and as those distinctions were founded on popular opinion, fostered by priestly influence, it was not very easy to counteract their effect, or foresee their termination.

Julius II. knew better than any one the advantage which he thus possessed, and he likewise knew the precise extent of it, so that in using it constantly, he seldom abused it; and thus it proved that he was successful beyond all expectation in the accomplishment of his most difficult designs. When he ascended the throne, he found the Duke de Valentinois in possession of many cities in the Romagna, which the latter had usurped during the reign of Alexander, and of which he appropriated the revenues. Him, the most dissembling of men, Julius in some measure supplanted by dissimulation†. From another nobleman (Paolo Baglioni) he recovered the city of Perugia by singular audacity; he

His successes. suddenly entered the hold of his enemy with his cardinals only, attended by no escort, and in such guise reclaimed and recovered his rights of sovereignty. He compelled the Venetians to restore several places which they had conquered from the Holy See—Rimini, Faenza, Ravenna, Cervia; and before the end of his pontificate, he had established a direct authority over all the cities which constitute the ecclesiastical states. Even in Milan he was almost paramount, while Modena, Reggio, Parma, Piacenza, were held in the name of the Church‡. And some have supposed, that, had his reign been prolonged for a very few years, the whole extent of Italy would have been united under the *sceptre* of St. Peter.

The object, however, which he more openly professed, and which was at least honourable to his patriotism, was the expulsion of all foreigners

* The same who caused a coin to be struck, bearing the inscription, *Perdam Babylonis nomen*.

† Alexander VI., who detested Julian, always admitted that he had one, though only one, redeeming quality: it was veracity. This reputation, Guicciardini says, gave him great opportunities of lying with advantage. Nevertheless, in this case, having the Duke's person entirely in his power, he certainly did not treat him so ill as the principles of his enemies, and even of his age would have justified, nor nearly so severely as many expected and hoped.

‡ See Denina, *Rivol. d' Ital.*, lib. xix. cap. vii. and lib. xx. cap. i., ii., iii.

(Barbari) from the soil of Italy. The measures, by which he pursued that object, belong to civil history, as well as the splendid reputation which they acquired for him. The talents and the qualities of Philip and Alexander are described by the panegyrists of Julius, as combined in him: even in their vices he resembled them—anger and intemperance. Respecting the particulars of his policy, it is recorded that he never would listen to any proposal of peace, so long as war, with any promise of success, was open to him; yet that he so conducted war, as to be in perpetual negotiation. Enemies, as well as friends, were made to serve his designs, and distant, as well as neighbouring, powers. He was so fierce and indefatigable a warrior, that at an age almost decrepit he did not shrink, when necessary, from sharing the severest toils of the meanest soldiers; but, at the same time, no one ever wielded the spiritual weapon with more imposing authority than Julius. His energy in the Vatican was scarcely surpassed by his bravery in the field; and he dictated a bull with the same energy with which he commanded an army. It was, moreover, particularly remarked, that he directed the ecclesiastical functions, and mingled in the holy services, with wonderful decorum and solemnity: thus under no circumstances forgetting the advantages to be derived from his sacred office, nor ever failing to make it the means of raising his personal dignity, or advancing his political purposes.

Another proof of the expanded mind of Julius II. was, his patronage of the arts of peace, which had suffered in the general degradation of the preceding pontificates. Many celebrated masters flourished during his reign, and his encouragement was never wanting to animate, nor his liberality to support them. The foundations of St. Peter's, after being designed by Nicholas V., were finally laid by Julius; and to prove the value which he attached to that undertaking, he placed the first stone with his own hand. The accumulation of so many and such various qualities in one character leaves no space to doubt his extraordinary capacity. And could we be contented to consider him only as a secular prince—could we forget that he was really the chief of the Church of Christ, and that he professed to be his vicerent—the homage which is extorted by his genius, his audacity, and the ambitious grandeur of his spirit, however qualified by his political immorality, would be offered with less reluctance.

But the Popes, even during this their season of licentiousness, had not wholly forgotten the lessons inculcated at Constance and Basle; and among the various dangers to which they were liable, the name which ever filled them with the deepest apprehension, was that of a general Council. And thus, when Julius engaged* to convoke such an assembly within two years from his election, nothing was farther from his intention than to keep his faith, and in effect he constantly eluded every proposition tending to that end. The king of France saw the advantage thus given him; and as there was also a party in the sacred college, which, through an honest regard for the Church, or a personal displeasure against the Pope, (for Julius II., by an ungracious and disdainful manner, frequently offended even those whom he intended to oblige,) boldly clamoured for

*His patronage
of the Arts.*

*Some Cardinals
convoke a Coun-
cil at Pisa.*

* Raynaldi, Annales, 1563, s. i., &c. It should, perhaps, be mentioned, that Julius published, in 1506, a severe edict against the simoniacal election of Popes. He pronounced Popes so elected to be Heresiarchs, and consequently degraded and deposed. The decree was confirmed in the Lateran Council which followed.

the redemption of his pledge, Louis at length prevailed upon them to summon the council on their own authority. They were nine in number; and the city which they appointed for the assembly was Pisa; it was a place convenient to the French and Italian prelates, and it contained, in its own history, the precedent of a general council, summoned by cardinals. The emperor Maximilian gave only a cold assent to these proceedings. Julius exerted every nerve to crush the project: nevertheless, the prelates met together, and the council was formally opened on the 1st of November, 1511. Presently some tumults between the French and Florentine soldiers alarmed the fathers; and after the third session they retired to Milan, where they were entirely under French protection. During that winter and the following spring they held five other sessions; and then, as the German bishops had never joined them, and as the emperor had at length withdrawn even the equivocal countenance hitherto vouchsafed to them, they retired, for the second time, from Milan to Lyons. But on this last removal, notwithstanding the efforts of Louis to give dignity and power to the refugees, the council became virtually extinct.

It is unnecessary to particularize the respective acts of the eight sessions of that assembly, not only because they were never carried into effect, but because they were entirely directed to one subject—the relative authority of the council and the Pope. Julius, on his side, thundered from the Vatican; he excommunicated all the members; he degraded and deprived the cardinals. They, on their part, after some verbose declarations, summoned the Pope into their presence, declared him contumacious, and finally suspended him. But this was their last effort, and the signal, as it were, for their extinction; and the blow thus impotently dealt by the expiring assembly was not felt on the Throne of St. Peter*.

Nevertheless, this short-lived council in some measure achieved its professed purpose. Julius, in the first instance, really feared it; and he then saw no effectual method of crushing it, except the convocation of a rival council. He therefore issued a summons to the Catholic hierarchy, to assemble at Rome, in April, 1512, for the celebration of the fifth Lateran council; and on the 3rd of May he opened it in person, with extraordinary dignity and solemnity. Fifteen cardinals, and about eighty archbishops and bishops were present; but it must not be forgotten, that almost all were Italians. During the nine following months five sessions were held, in which no subject of any ecclesiastical importance was proposed†, except the Pragmatic Sanction; and this was treated in a spirit of such undisguised hostility to the French court and Church, as to show very clearly what were the uses to which Julius intended to turn his council. But he was interrupted by a fatal sickness. On the night of February 20, 1513, he died; and it was the last recorded act of his life, to refuse the cardinal's hat to an undeserving claimant. When the Pope was on the point of death, the boon was earnestly solicited by a very near relative,

* The contest, literally speaking, did not cease here. Julius pursued his adversaries into France, and laid the kingdom which harboured them under an interdict. But though some fresh controversies then arose on the old subject—the comparative *ausferibility* of a council and a Pope,—it was clearly the king, who was now fighting the battle, not the council.

† The confirmation of Julius's former decree against the simoniacal election of Popes, should, perhaps, be considered as important, though there could be no great hope of its efficacy—not, at least, till the constitution of the sacred college was wholly changed.

—a woman, for her own brother. Julius coldly replied, ‘that the person was unworthy,’ and then turned his head away, and expired.

He was succeeded by Leo X.—a name which belongs to the history of the Reformation, and with which, in this work, we are no further concerned, than as we propose to follow the council, *Leo X.* assembled by his predecessor, through its remaining deliberations. Before the end of the year it held three more sessions, under the presidency of the new Pope: the sixth and seventh produced no memorable enactments, but the eighth was somewhat more important. On this occasion the king of France at length announced his adhesion. A bull was likewise published, for the purpose of establishing the separate existence and immortality of the soul against the dangerous and, as it would seem, prevalent theories of certain philosophers; and at the same time an edict of safe-conduct was granted to the Bohemian schismatics, with an invitation to assist at the council: for their heresy was again rising into formidable attention. These measures were followed by a decree, directed against the *officers* of the apostolical court, for the diminution of their fees or salaries. On the 5th of May, 1514, the prelates proceeded from the abuses of their dependants to the consideration of their own; and on this occasion they published an imposing body of regulations for the reformation of the Roman court, and the general discipline of the Church. It was enacted, that only persons of worth and morality should be appointed to benefices: to bishoprics, at an age not earlier than twenty-seven years; to abbeys, not earlier than twenty-two; and that care should be taken to ascertain their merit, before their names were proposed in consistory. That deprivation should only be inflicted after due examination. That monasteries and abbeys should not be held *in commendam*, unless for the better preservation of the authority of the Holy See, and by cardinals or other persons qualified; and that cures and dignities of little value (less than 200 ducats a year) should not be so held even by cardinals. That there be no separation or union of Churches, unless for a reasonable cause. That no dispensation be granted to hold more than two incompatible benefices, unless to persons qualified, and for sufficient reasons. That persons possessing more than four benefices, cures, or dignities, be obliged, within two years, to reduce them to the number of four, by resigning the rest.

*Canons of
Reformation.*

It was likewise ordained, that the cardinals should lead an exemplary life,—celebrating mass in their chapels, observing perfect sacerdotal modesty in their house, furniture, and tables, to the exclusion of all secular pomp; treating with honour and respect those about them; attentive to the interests of the poor, no less than to those of princes; visiting in person, or by deputy, their titular churches; providing for the prosperity of the monasteries, or benefices, which they might hold *in commendam*; avoiding every show of luxury, and every suspicion of avarice in their attendants. Respecting the inferior members of the court of Rome, a number of laws were published against blasphemy, concubinage, and simony. It was strictly prohibited to all kings, princes, and lords, to seize or sequester the ecclesiastical property, *unless by permission of the Pope*. All the laws concerning the exemption of ecclesiastical persons and goods from lay jurisdiction were confirmed. And lastly, the inquisitions were stimulated to proceed zealously against heretics* and Jews;

* ‘How ill, alas! (says Raynaldus,) these most holy laws were observed, appears from

especially against those who had relapsed, from whom every hope of pardon was withheld. . . . On the above regulations, which formed the substance of the most important decree of this council, it is scarcely necessary to observe, that they touched very ineffectually even those few among the multifarious corruptions of the Church, which they touched at all; that, in respect to the Court of Rome, as no attempt was made to reduce one fraction of its power and wealth, it was superfluous to publish general exhortations of modesty and humility; and, besides, that the principal points in dispute with France and Germany were entirely overlooked in this reformation of the Catholic Church.

A year afterwards, (on May 4, 1515,) the council held its tenth session. It then published a decree to restrain some of the abuses of chapters; to moderate, though very slightly, the granting of exemptions; to refer the decision of trifling suits respecting the smaller benefices to the ordinaries; and to encourage provincial councils. Another decree peremptorily cited the ecclesiastics of France to appear at the council, and show sufficient reasons why the Pragmatic Sanction should not be wholly abolished. Another, promulgated on the same

The Press. occasion, was levelled against the presumed abuses of the press. The Pope (an enlightened and literary Pope) pronounced to the effect, 'that, though knowledge was acquired by reading, and though the press much facilitated such acquirement, the cultivation of the mind, the instruction of Christians, and the consequent propagation of the faith and the Church; yet, as it had reached the ears of his Holiness, how some printers had published many Latin translations from the Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldean, which contained false and pernicious dogmas, and offended the reputation of persons in dignity, he was bound to ordain, in his desire to remedy that evil, that no book should be hereafter printed at Rome, or in any other city or diocese, until it had been examined—at Rome by the vicar of his Holiness, and the master of the sacred palace—in other dioceses, by the bishop, or some doctor appointed by him, or by the inquisitor of the place, on pain of immediate excommunication*.'

The next session was not held till the 19th of December, 1516. The Pope found himself at the head of a very tractable assembly, still consisting almost entirely of Italian prelates, and yielding obsequious approbation to decrees dictated from the Vatican. Thus, without any display of impatience, he steadily pursued that which seems to have been the only object of his predecessor in this matter, and which was clearly the leading one with himself,—the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. In the present session he accomplished that design; and the bull which he published on the occasion is worthy of the proudest days of pontifical despotism. He began by asserting the implicit obedience due by divine authority to the Holy See, and afterwards took occasion especially to confirm and renew the constitution *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. He showed the illegality and schismatic nature of the 'Sanction,' by disparaging the councils of Bourges and Basle, and proclaimed the unlimited

the hydra-birth of the Lutheran heresy, which came so soon afterwards.' Ann. 1514. sect. 31, &c.

* This was not the first effort of the Popes against what they considered the abuses of the press. In 1501, Alexander VI. ordained, under the severest penalties, that no books should be printed in any diocese, without the sanction of the bishop (Raynaldus, 1501, s. 36). But Sixtus IV. has the distinction of being the first who established that inquisition.

control of the Pope over such assemblies; and finally, by his certain knowledge, by the plenitude of his power, and with the approbation of the holy council, he annulled all the decrees, statutes,¹ and regulations contained in the offensive enactment.

The bull received the assent of the council, with only one dissentient voice. The bishop of a small diocese in Lombardy had the boldness to express his veneration for the councils of Bourges and Basle, and his reluctance to disturb their inviolable decisions. But he was immediately overborne; the authority of the present (it was argued) was not inferior to that of preceding assemblies; and in ancient times St. Leo had revoked at Chalcedon, what had been too rashly ordained at Ephesus. Yet such arguments might not effectually have served the Pontiff, had not Francis I. conspired to betray the liberties of his Church. The abolition of the Sanction was immediately followed by the publication of a concordat, which tacitly restored the possession of *Annates* to the Pope*, and openly transferred a valuable portion of the ecclesiastical patronage to the king. During the same session, certain restrictions were imposed upon the license of preachers, and generally upon the discipline of the monastic orders; but these last were compensated by some privileges, which, though of no great apparent importance, offended the jealousy of the bishops, and roused some opposition in the council. The assembly divided, but the majority was in favour of the papal measures.

On the 16th of the following March (1517), the council met for the twelfth and concluding session, and after prohibiting the popular practice of pillaging the mansion of the Pope elect, and ordaining an imposition of tenths for the service of the Turkish war, it was dissolved. The bull of dissolution announced the accomplishment of every object of the assembly: peace had been re-established among the princes of Christendom; the schismatic synod of Pisa abolished; and, above all, the reformation of the Church and court of Rome had been sufficiently provided for! There were, indeed, some fathers who ventured to argue, that every abuse had not even yet been removed, and that the lasting interests of the Church would be better promoted by the further continuance of the council—but the majority supported the Pope; and the last universal assembly of the western Church, after having deliberately regulated all matters requiring any attention, and restored the establishment to perfect health and security, separated with complacency and confidence! And here we may mention, (for the coincidence is remarkable,) that in the very same year, almost before the assembled prelates had concluded their mutual congratulations on the peace, and unity, and purity, of the apostolical

*Dissolution of
the Council.*

* The Annates were not expressly mentioned in the Concordat. But as the Pragmatic, which had alone abolished that payment, was itself abolished, the right to the payment was restored; at least, it was left on the same footing on which it stood before the Sanction, and then it was commonly levied by the Pope. In fact, in the ecclesiastical writers on this subject, the words *pragmatic sanction*, and *annates*, are so constantly connected, as to make it very clear, that the recovery of that contribution was a great object with the Popes in their enmity to the Sanction, as the exemption from it may have been a great cause of attachment to their liberties with the clergy of France. The question continued where it was then placed, till the arrangement brought about by Bossuet, in 1682. The arguments by which the conduct of Francis has been defended are—that many of the sees and monasteries were of royal foundation; that much confusion was occasioned by the popular method of election; that when subjects entrust the sovereign with the government of the state, that of the Church is therein included, &c. &c.

Church, Luther commenced, in the schools of Wittenberg, his public preaching against its most revolting corruption.

Though it is not strictly true, that the history of the Popes, from Nicholas V. to Leo X., presents, so far as their personal characters are concerned, a series of uniform degeneracy; yet the principles of their government being bad, and not being corrected, became gradually and necessarily worse.

And thus, though the name of Julius II. fills us with much less abhorrence than that of Alexander VI., the policy of the apostolical See was never so directly opposed to every spiritual object, as when guided by the former: ends purely temporal were never pursued with such undisguised vehemence, or by means so sanguinary; the keys of St. Peter, though not wholly cast away, were never before so merely subsidiary to the sword of St. Paul*; insomuch, that the hand of a retributive providence might almost seem to be traced in this circumstance—that the long succession of spiritual usurpers, who were the chiefs of a religion of peace and the professed vicegerents of the God of love, should terminate at length in a *military* pontiff. The patience of angels and of men was exhausted by this last mockery; and the more daring the exploits of the soldier, and the more splendid the conquests of the prince, the more awful was the bolt which was even then descending to rend his spiritual empire.

We should also observe, respecting the Popes described in this chapter, that there was scarcely one whose government did not deteriorate as it proceeded. Almost all began their reign with some promises of religious practice, or ecclesiastical reform, or broad European policy; and some, for the first year or two, observed such promises. But their reigns, upon the whole, much exceeded the usual duration of pontifical power, and they had space to imbibe the corruption which surrounded them; so that even those who carried with them into the Vatican the ordinary principles of human conduct, presently forgot them in the society of debauched parasites, in the iniquities of a simoniacal court, in the administration of a system full of every impurity. Thus are we in no manner surprised, when we observe these sovereigns engrossed by the temporal interests of their states, and engaged in securing their power within the city, and extending their sway without it: this was merely to govern like secular princes, and to pursue the policy which some of the greatest among their own predecessors had bequeathed to them. But the vice peculiarly characteristic of this race, and that which reduced them below the level of former pontiffs, was Nepotism†. It was for this that the keys and the sword co-operated; that benefices were publicly sold, and the

* The popular story, that Julius II. actually threw the keys into the Tiber, and drew the sword of St. Paul, seems to be founded (at least so thinks Bayle) on the following *ut fama est* of an obscure poet, Gilbertus Ducherius Vultus:—

In Gallum, ut fama est, bellum gesturus acerbum,

Armata educit Julius Urbe manum.

Accinctus gladio Claves in Tybridis amnem

Projicit, et sævus talia verba facit—

Quum Petri nihil efficiant ad prælia Claves,

Auxilio Pauli forsitan ensis erit.

† (1.) Eugenius IV. was nephew of Gregory XII; (2.) Paul II., of Eugenius IV.; (3.) Alexander VI., of Calixtus III.; (4.) Pius III., of Pius II.; (5.) Julius II., of Sixtus IV.; (6.) and finally, Leo X. was brother-in-law of the bastard of Innocent VIII. We should remark, however, that the thirst for aggrandizing their own families was not peculiar to the Popes, though peculiarly disgraceful to them. It was connected with that general struggle for super-eminence among private families which distinguished the history of Italy during this century.

pontificate all but publicly bought—that the nephews and bastards of a profligate Pope might be enriched and aggrandized. Many fiefs of the Church were alienated for that purpose; and what was of worse consequence than this, the chief of the Church thus acquired a new motive for attachment to its abuses, and repugnance to any serious reformation. If Julius II. was less tainted with this vice than those who immediately preceded him*—for Julius mingled some magnanimity with his worldliness,—it was presently restored to honour by Leo X., and resumed its dominion over the counsels of the Vatican.

Another circumstance that strikes us, in the consideration of this period, is the utter debasement to which the Sacred College finally descended. The influence, which the most wicked Pope invariably acquired in consistory, may be ascribed to the less direct operation of his power and patronage. But the secrets of the conclave, which have been transmitted by contemporary writers, abound with the particulars of intrigue, and undisguised perfidy, and unblushing venality. Such was the mutual consciousness with which the Pope and his senate assembled to govern the Church of Christ! such the councils, from which edicts were issued for the suppression of simony and the correction of the morals of the clergy! Again, it was now become almost the practice of the Conclave to bind the future Pope by a solemn obligation, intended to influence the nature of his government. The cardinal, while on the point of being elected, voluntarily took this oath, in common with his colleagues; and immediately after his election he confirmed it. In a similar manner, restrictions were at that time not uncommonly imposed by the elective body on the emperor of Germany and the king of Poland, and they were found effectual. But at Rome the result was so far otherwise, that among the many who undertook such engagements, there seems not to have been one, who faithfully observed what he had sworn, first as cardinal, next as Pope. This distinction, so shameful to the Court of Rome, confirms the charges of supereminent immorality commonly brought against it: it proceeds, however, from the singular principles of the papal hierarchy. In the first place, the Pope, who enjoyed power unlimited over the obligations of others, might reasonably claim the right to dispense with his own. In the next, he had means of influencing those who might release him from his engagements, or connive at his contempt of them, such as the crown did not possess, either in Germany or Poland. The immense extent of his patronage, his authority over the property and persons of the cardinals, and his prerogative of creating others, gave him irresistible instruments both of seduction and terror. He exercised them unsparingly; and the result was, that among the various crimes of the Vatican, that which became, as it were, peculiarly pontifical, was perjury.

While the crimes of the Vatican were indeed so various, as to embrace almost every denomination of ungodliness, there was not one among the Popes of this period, who made even the slightest pretension to piety; scarcely one, by whom decency, as well as morality and religion, was not grossly outraged. Indeed, when we consider the enormity of the scandals permitted and perpetrated by Popes and cardinals during the latter years, it seems a matter of wonder that the whole Christian world did not rouse

* 'Julius designed to make himself master of Bologna, and extinguish the Venetians, and chase the French out of Italy; and these projects all proved fortunate to him, and so much the more to his praise, in that he did all for the good of the Church, and in no private regard.' Machiavel (Principe, cap. xi.) is no great eulogist of Julius.

itself, as by an earthquake, and destroy them. But here it must be observed, that however notorious was the infamy of the Roman court to the nobles, and even the people of Rome; however generally it might be related and credited, even throughout Italy, that country profited too extensively by the tributes of foreign superstition, to feel any desire to close their sources: besides which, Italy, having long exhibited less regard than any other land for the spiritual treasures and censures of Rome, was less disgusted by the spectacle of her vices. But beyond the Alps, where a just indignation would really have been excited, the private arrangements of the conclave, and even the secrets of the pontifical palace did yet rarely or imperfectly transpire—a sacred veil still continued to conceal the impurities of the Fathers of the Church, nor was it raised, until the barriers were at length broken by Charles VIII., and the natives of every country were admitted to a nearer view of the pontifical mysteries.

Another circumstance, which made men less disposed to rebellion against the Holy See, was the literary character of *Literary Popes*. some of the later pontiffs. The genius and accomplishments of Nicholas V., of Pius II., and even of Sixtus IV., threw a light round the chair of St. Peter, which dazzled, and for a while deceived, the Cisalpine nations. Besides, the vices of the court were really less general during those reigns; for if the example of the Pope did not necessarily influence all his cardinals, at least his own character directed him in the choice of those whom he created; so that it is not uncommon, during this period, to find respectable authors*, as well as patrons of learning, among the members of the Sacred College. But in the example of Sixtus, evil upon the whole predominated; and those who next succeeded, presented models of flagitiousness almost unqualified, so that the effect produced upon the Christian world by the brilliancy of those former reigns, gradually faded away; and when Leo X. restored the image of a splendid pontificate, it was too late to prevent the out-breaking of settled, deliberate discontent.

The period described in this chapter was also marked by one other feature very deserving of attention;—the hostility of *Efforts against the Turks*. the Turk, and the consequent clamour for a grand Christian confederacy. In former ages the calamities of the Holy Land and the pollution of the tomb of Christ were motives sufficient to arm the indignation of the west. As time proceeded, and knowledge slowly advanced, and wisdom still more slowly followed it, that rage at length evaporated: but not till the Popes had turned it, in various manners, to their own profit, to enrich and aggrandize their See, and to *unite* the Catholic Church. Precisely after the same fashion, as far as the altered principles of the age would allow, did the Vatican treat the question of the Turkish conquests. In this case, there was more of reason in the outcry, and proportionably less of superstition; the danger was sometimes imminent; it was never very remote; and the projected crusade was virtually defensive. It is not that some Popes were not very sincere, especially in the beginning of their reigns, in their exhortations to arm against the infidel—and some had been equally earnest in former ages, in their exertions for the liberation

* Some of these—for instance Cardinal Bessarion, who died under Sixtus IV.—were the creations of an earlier period—the turbulent times of Constance and Basle, when the Roman court was obliged, in self-defence, to adopt men of some learning and talents. The works of Bessarion are enumerated and described by the Continuator of Fleury (p. 113, 126). His defence of platonism (in *Calumniatorem Platonis*) against George of Trebison is the most celebrated of his writings.

of Palestine—but many more were not so: yet these raised the same outcry, and repeated as loudly the same arguments and declamations. One of them, indeed, Paul II., so closely imitated the worst exploit of Innocent III., as to divert the course of war from its purposed channel, and direct it against Christian heretics. But the others, when not absolutely threatened by invasion, had, for the most part, two objects in their vociferations; the one, to bring money into the apostolical chamber; the other, to drown the reviving demands for Church reform, and turn the thoughts of men to any subject, rather than a general council*. In both these objects they, for a time, succeeded—unhappily for the age in which they lived, unhappily for the permanence of their own empire. But it was God's providence which ordered this—to the end that the reformation should be more full and perfect, owing to the very blindness which had retarded it, and to the very bigotry which thought to withhold it for ever. For, however various the opinions prevalent at the moment, there can now be no question, that if the court of Rome had zealously employed itself, during this period of seventy-four years, in removing its scandals, in amending its morals, in retrenching its more extravagant claims, in reducing its expenses, and moderating its exactions, it might have continued, according to all human calculation, to sway for some time longer the spiritual destinies of Europe.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

PRELIMINARIES OF THE REFORMATION

SECTION I.—*On the Power and Constitution of the Roman Catholic Church.*

- (1) Origin, progress, and prosperity of the Pope's secular monarchy—Character and policy of Julius II.—Excuse for the union of the two powers in the Pope—Evils proceeding from it. (2) The spiritual supremacy of Rome—its rise, character, and extent—Usurpation of Church patronage—pretensions to personal infallibility—control over the general morality—in Penance, Purgatory, and Indulgences—decline of the power—not of the pretensions. (3) Claims of Rome to universal temporal supremacy—as advanced by Gregory VII.—on what founded—by what means supported—use and abuse of this power. (4) Constitution of the Church. Origin and gradual aggrandizement of the Cardinals—to the rank of kings—The capitulations sworn in Conclave, and invariably violated—Relative interests and influence of the Pope and the Sacred College—to the advantage of the former—its usual co-operation with the Pontiff—General Councils—subordinate machinery of the Church—highest dignities accessible to all ranks—Good and evil of this—Envoys and emissaries—Mendicants—Inquisition—Moral extremes permitted—Maxims of policy—Methods of securing the obedience of the lowest classes.

SECTION II.—*On the Spiritual Character, Discipline, and Morals of the Church.*

- (1) Conservation of the most essential doctrines—Various innovations—Original system of penance—the Penitential of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury—subsequent abuses—The intermediate state—Purgatory—Original object and gradual abuse of indulgences—in nature and in object—Translation of an indulgence published by Tetzel—Prayers for the dead—Masses, public and private. The mystery of the Eucharist—The elevation of the Host—use of the bell—worship of the Host—Communion in one kind only—its object and impolicy—Prohibition of the Scriptures—Miraculous impostures—Saints, relics, &c.—More recent disputes and superstitions—on the ring of St. Catharine—and her Stigmata—on the Immaculate Conception—on the Worship due to the

* Sixtus IV., when pressed, in 1472, by the king of France, to call a general council, openly pleaded, as an objection, the urgency of the Turkish war. 'It was out of season (the Pope replied) to demand the convocation of a council, which required considerable time, when the evil was pressing, and the progress of the Turks rendered the slightest delays prejudicial to religion; the other Christian princes had either kept their engagements, or were on the point of keeping them; and the king of France should rather join them in so holy a work, and permit the levying of tenths, and other charitable contributions, throughout his kingdom, &c.' See Contin. Fleury, L. 113, s. 145.

blood of Christ—the inscription on the Cross—the reed and sponge. (2) Discipline and morals—Concubinage of the Clergy—Influence of the laity—Perpetual acknowledgment of Church abuses from St. Bernard downwards—Cardinal Ximenes—Benefits conferred by the Church—in ignorant ages—Truce of God—Exercise of charity—Law of asylum—penance, &c.—Original character of Monachism—Merits of the Mendicants—chiefly as Missionaries—their success in the thirteenth and fourteenth ages—Morality in the fifteenth century comprised in the Mystics and the lower Clergy—Progress and preservation of Mysticism in the Western Church—Great, though obscure, virtues of many of the Inferior Clergy.

SECTION III.—*On various Attempts to reform or subvert the Church.*

- (1) Attempts at self-reform—The era of Boniface VIII.—subsequent decline—Necessity of some reform generally admitted—Designs of the Church reformers, as compared with the real nature of the corruptions—confined wholly to matters of revenue and discipline—very imperfect even in that respect—and never really enforced—Learning and blindness of the papal party—their momentary success—Progress of improvement and knowledge to final and certain triumph—Tardy reformation in the Roman Catholic Church. (2) Attempts of Protestants to trace their Church to the Apostolic times—how far successful—where they fail—Vaudois and Albigeois—Bohemian Brethren—*Note on Bossuet*—Errors of those Dissenters—On the Paulicians—On the Mystics—Real value and merit of the sects of the twelfth and following centuries. (3) Treatment of heretics by the Church—Canon of Innocent III.—its fair explanation—consequence—Inquisition—Unity of the Church—A more moderate party—Principle of intolerance adopted by the Laity also—Conduct of the Church in the fifteenth age. (4) On some individual witnesses of the truth—John of Wesalia—Wesselus—Jean Laillier—Savonarola—his history and pretensions—Erasmus. (5) Particular condition of Germany—Great scene of clerical licentiousness and papal extortion—Political hostilities of Rome and the Empire—Violation of the Concordats—‘The Hundred Grievances’—Thirst of the people for the Bible—Character of Leo X.—Conclusion.

SECTION I.—*On the Power and Constitution of the Roman Catholic Church.*

I.—IN retracing the steps by which Papacy descended to that ground whereon it received its effectual overthrow, we shall observe in most of its elements signs of increasing corruption and decay; but there was one circumstance, in which its singular prosperity ran counter to the general current. The temporal monarchy of the Pope was at no former period so extensive and so secure as at the accession of Leo X. At no time had the limits of the Ecclesiastical States been so widely stretched, or the factions, which alienated the capital from the government of its Bishop, so depressed and helpless as then. We have shown, in former chapters, how the Pope's political authority originated under the Exarchs of Ravenna, through the neglect or weakness of the Eastern empire; and how it was rivetted by the vigour and the virtues of some who then occupied the Chair. Soon afterwards the domains of the See were formed and enlarged by Pepin and Charlemagne, though still held by the latter as a dependent portion of his empire.

We have mentioned the donation of Matilda to Gregory VII., and the exertions afterwards made to secure those various possessions. In this struggle, Innocent III., and some other Popes of the thirteenth century, obtained partial, though never permanent, successes; and the territories of Boniface VIII. were more respectable in magnitude, than united in allegiance and fidelity. But the secession to Avignon was the signal for general insubordination; on every side the Barons rose and seized whatever lay within their grasp; and the patrimony of St. Peter was torn in pieces by their petty ambition and rapacity*.

* ‘Je regarde Rome (says Voltaire, *Pyrrhonisme de l'Histoire*) depuis le temps de l'Empereur Leo III. l'Isaurien, comme une ville libre, protégée par les Francs, ensuite par les Germains, qui se gouverne tant qu'elle put en république, plutôt sous le patronage que

The Schism followed : and, if the residence of an Antipope recovered some portion of that authority which had been forfeited by the absence of the Pope, yet it was not much that was resumed, nor was it held with firmness or confidence. But when the Schism had ceased, and a Bishop of undisputed legitimacy became again resident, though Martin, Eugenius, Nicholas, and Sixtus* even then had some storms and reverses to encounter, the machine of temporal power upon the whole moved onwards ; and at length, under the guidance of Alexander VI. and Julius II., it reached those ample boundaries, from which it has never since receded.

The dangerous feuds of the Colonna and Orsini were extinguished ; the usurpations on the states of the Church were extorted from the nobles who had made them ; even the turbulence of the Roman people was worn down by severity, or softened by luxury and licentiousness ; and a compact and fruitful kingdom bowed in secular servitude before the sceptre of St. Peter.

The emperor Maximilian designed himself as the successor of Julius II. and solicited the votes of several members of the college, some little time before the death of that Pope. He did not strongly press his project ; but the very attempt may show how little necessary any pretensions to the spiritual character were then thought for the enjoyment of the loftiest spiritual dignity. Julius was, in all essentials, a temporal prince ; and had he not been so, he could scarcely have crowned his ambition with such extraordinary triumphs. Yet the spectacle of a secular and military Pope † was not well calculated to conciliate to the See, in the most critical moment of its history, the affection or respect of any description of Christians. The deep penetration of Julius may possibly have foreseen the approaching downfall of the spiritual supremacy, and for that reason he may have laboured the more zealously to give strength to the temporal fabric. If he did so, it was a wise and salutary providence ; for, in that controversy so often raised—whether the secular dominion of the pope has tended, upon the whole, to increase or to diminish his general influence,—there is ample room for difference, in respect to early times ; but after the first movements of the Reformation, it is quite clear that it produced to him nothing but advantage : and from that moment the question rather becomes, whether any shred or fragment of his ghostly authority could have been saved without it.

sous la puissance des Empereurs, dans laquelle le souverain Pontife eut toujours le premier crédit, et qui enfin a été entièrement soumise aux Papes.' It is observed, that no Pope ever assumed the title of King of Rome. This subject is remarkably well treated by Gibbon, in his 49th chapter.

* Gibbon has remarked, that Eugenius IV. was the last Pope expelled by the tumults of the Roman people (in 1434) ; and Nicholas V. (in 1447) the last importuned by the presence of the Emperor. The same writer places the last disorder of the Nobles of Rome under Sixtus IV. and considers the papal dominion to have become absolute about the year 1500. Machiavel (*Prencipe*, cap. xi.) has observed, that the great difficulty in crushing the two rival factions in Rome arose from the short reigns of the Popes, and the inconstancy of their policy : for when any Pontiff had succeeded in humbling one of those families, his successor might, very probably, raise it up again and depress the opposite. On the other hand, the existence of this feud accounted, in a great degree, for the temporal weakness of the Popes. At length, Alexander VI. and his son overthrew the Barons from motives of *family* ambition, and Julius II. reaped the fruits of their victory for the advantage of the Church.

† A plausible precedent was afforded by the personal expedition made by that simple, pious Pontiff, Leo IX. against the Normans who so signally overthrew him. But it should be recollected, that Leo never repeated the experiment—his military thirst was satisfied by a single enterprise.

Argument for the Pope's Secular Monarchy. The enjoyment of secular power and pride by the Vicegerent of Him whose kingdom is not of this world, is justified on the ground of his independence. It is plausibly maintained, that the Chief of the Œcumenic Church, scattered throughout so many nations, ought to stand unconstrained by any earthly potentate, and owe no other allegiance than that to heaven. The principle, which would prevent him from being a subject, compels him to be a monarch,—no other condition can be conceived, which could secure him from the control of the temporal sceptre. The above argument acquires some confirmation from the decline which did, in fact, take place in the pontifical domination during the exile at Avignon, though the Pope was there resident rather as a guest than as a subject, free from the direct authority of the prince, the slave only of his influence. In truth, the Catholic, after he has assumed the divine establishment of one spiritual universal monarchy, wants not sufficient plea for the maintenance of the temporal government, as secondary and subsidiary. But the Protestant, thoughtfully surveying the perplexities, the intrigues, and the crimes in which a Christian Prelate is thus necessarily involved—the armies which he levies, the contributions which he extorts, the blood which he sheds—receives from the sad spectacle only fresh reason to doubt, whether the family of Christ has really been consigned to the rule of *one*, who can scarcely rule it in innocence.

And this remark is the more striking, because, when we reflect on the different wars which the Popes have waged in Italy, it really appears that they had, for the most part, the plea of justice. It was generally their object, (notwithstanding some deplorable exceptions,) not to make conquests in the dominions of others, but to defend or to recover their own. There was no province in Europe so harassed by rebellions and usurpations as the states of the Church. We need not pause to account for this circumstance; but it is unquestionably true that no other prince was so commonly liable to depredation and insult as the Pope. Accordingly, his wars were usually defensive, and (it may be) necessary—but that very necessity annihilated the pastoral character, and despiritualized the Vicar of Christ.

Again, these contests were not carried on without great expense; and the holy See, despoiled of its patrimony, was at the same time deprived of its natural resources. Thence arose *The Tributes which he levied.* an obligation to seek supplies in other quarters*; and with an obedient clergy and a superstitious people it was not difficult to make the whole of Christendom tributary. Once in possession of this ample treasury, and of the keys which unlocked its innumerable chambers, the Pontiffs explored and ransacked it without restraint, without decency, without discretion. Their emissaries were dreaded as the tax-gatherers of the Christian world. Their name was associated with donations, fees, contributions, exactions—with every name that is most vile and unpopular in secular governments. And thus, besides the great scandal thereby reflected upon themselves, they exhausted the affection, the endurance, and almost the credulity of the faithful. It is not that the monies thus levied were applied *entirely* to the defence of the Ecclesiastical States, or even that they were generally levied under that pretence;

* This system no doubt began soon after the eleventh age, when the Popes were so commonly expelled from Rome, to Orvieto, Viterbo, Anagni, &c., and obliged to look to all parts of Christendom for their resources.

but in the first instance, during the thirteenth century, and afterwards, more especially under the Avignon succession, a very large proportion was certainly absorbed by the temporal exigencies of the See, and the increasing demands and extravagance of the Court of Rome. The same system was continued through the Schism and the century which followed it, as far as the Popes had power to continue it; and therefore, when we admire their final success in erecting a permanent principality, we shall, at the same time, recollect the methods which they had so long and so vainly employed on that object, and the deep disaffection towards their Government which those methods had every where created.

II.—It is not necessary to retrace the process, by which the spiritual supremacy of Rome was engendered and nourished. We have observed with sufficient distinctness, how equivocal and circumscribed it was in nature and dimensions, when it entered into the ages of gloom and ignorance,—how it grew and dilated in its mysterious passage through them;—how portentous in magnitude and majesty it emerged from the cloud. We have followed it through its meridian course of disastrous glory; and we have seen that, even in its decline, it did not suddenly lose either its fierceness or its ascendancy. Indeed, however strange it may seem, that an authority, so predominant in its power, so universal and searching in its influence, so extravagant in its pretensions, should have been at all created, and out of materials seemingly so incongruous; it would have been much more strange, had it been easily or hastily extinguished. An authority, which claimed the sanction of Heaven, and which stood on human imposture; which pleaded the holiness of antiquity, and which innovated every hour; which combined, in its composition, learning with fanaticism, the use of reason with its grossest abuse, extreme austerities with lawless licentiousness, much true piety with much vulgar and impious superstition—and which so applied those various qualities, as at length to acquire an influence in the policy of every Court, in the institutions of every Government, in the morals of every people, in the habits of every family, in the bosom of almost every individual—an authority, so constructed, supported, acknowledged, and felt, could not possibly fall in pieces without a protracted struggle and a final convulsion. It was impressed by the perseverance of fraud upon credulous, abject ignorance; but so deeply impressed, that, before it could be effaced, the substance whereon it was engraven must first change its nature; so that ages of gradual improvement were required to repair the mischief, which ages had conspired to inflict.

*The Spiritual
Supremacy of
Rome.*

For if we examine the extent of this power, with respect to the objects on which it was more immediately exerted, shall we find any department, religious or moral, into which, in its triumphant days, it did not penetrate? In the first place, the Pope was the fountain of all ecclesiastical legislation. All the Canons and Constitutions of the Church were subject to him*. He

* Immediately after burning the Pope's bull, Luther published several propositions, extracted from the Decretals, among which are the following:—'that the successors of St. Peter are not subject to the commandment of the apostle to obey the temporal powers; that the power of the emperor is as much below that of the Pope as the moon is below the sun; that the Pope is superior to councils, and can abolish their decrees; that all authority resides in his person; that no one has a right to judge him or his decrees; that God has given him sovereign power over all the kingdoms of the earth, and that of heaven; that he can depose kings, absolve all oaths and vows; that he is not dependent

could enact, suspend, abrogate, as might seem good to him, and that, not only with the advice or consent of the Consistory, or (as it sometimes happened) merely in its presence, but in the plenitude of his power, and by his own spontaneous movement*. At the same time, while he was supreme in his dominion over the laws, he claimed an entire exemption from their control, and found a powerful party in the Church to support his claim.

In the next place, he was the source of all pastoral jurisdiction. The final determination of every spiritual cause rested with him. He was the object of appeal from all the episcopal Courts; and he delivered, confirmed, or reversed decisions, according to the arbitrary dictates of his justice, or his interest.

The apostolical character of the ministry, perpetuated by the uninterrupted communication of the Holy Spirit, was held to centre in the successor of St. Peter: and thus not only did all sacerdotal sanctity emanate from him, but all the offices and dignities of the Church were vested in his See. We may observe, however, that there was not one among his pretensions which cost him so much toil and conflict to substantiate, as this. *Usurpation of Church Patronage.* In his earliest attempts to usurp the ecclesiastical patronage he was contented to proceed by simple recommendation; and, as he had already great power, his applications were seldom despised. Hence arose the practice; and from the practice, the right. The prerogative of institution, of which he had gradually despoiled the Metropolitans for the augmentation of his own dignity, was serviceable as an instrument of further encroachment. The fierce and protracted contest respecting investitures, between the See and the empire, was inflamed by the same design in the former; and when it terminated, the Pope found himself in legal possession of that power of occasional interference in the collation of benefices, which it needed no great address to improve and extend. Still, time and boldness were required to complete the usurpation; and the merit of achieving that work is perhaps justly attributed to Innocent III.† Soon afterwards the Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis was levelled against it; and in later periods it has been obtruded so commonly upon our attention, as almost to convert the

on Scripture, but, on the other hand, Scripture derives all its authority, force, and dignity, from him,' &c. (See Beausobre, *Hist. Réform.* liv. iii.) It is unnecessary to repeat, that the above propositions were either drawn from the False Decretals, or were of subsequent origin. Till the time of Valentinian III. neither the Eastern nor Western Church had any other collection of canons than the 'Code of Canons of the universal Church,' compiled by Stephen, bishop of Ephesus. In the first year of Justinian, the 'Collection of Dionysius the Little' was published. He was a monk, living at Rome—the same who introduced the practice of computing time from the birth of Christ—a friend, fellow-monk, and fellow-student of Cassiodorus. His collection contained the fifty Apostolical Canons, the Canons of Chalcedon, Sardica, and the African Councils; and the Decretals of Pope Siricius (who died in 398); and it had authority in the West under the name of 'Codex or Corpus Canonum.' Some other collections, of little repute, or only partial authority, were published soon afterwards. (See Giannone, *Stor. Napol.* lib. iii. c. v.) Then came the forgeries of the eighth age, and the pretensions—first proceeding from them, presently surpassing them—though it was scarcely till the twelfth century that the new maxims and principles came into full operation.

* *De motu proprio.* It appears that Bulls proceeding *de motu proprio* were received with great hesitation in France. But they were held by the high Papists to be as valid as any other Decrees or Canons.

† See Mosheim, *Cent. xiii.* p. ii. ch. ii. It was probably at this time that a new pretext for this extension of the papal authority was discovered: viz. that through the Pope's vigilance, the gates of the Church might be secured against the intrusion of any Heretic.

records of Christ's Church into a detail of disgusting squabbles about its temporalities. A new vocabulary was introduced into the history of religion; and as the magnificence of the Court of Rome kept pace with the majesty of the monarch, and as its avarice emulated his ambition, the field of *Reservation* and *Provision** was enlarged with no limit, and the whole patronage of the universal Church seemed to be absorbed by the cupidity of one man.

The same power which thus created Cardinals and Bishops, and all other dignitaries, presumed by the same right to confirm, censure, suspend or depose them†; so that the whole hierarchy of the west was placed at its arbitrary disposal‡. And though this inordinate despotism was continually resisted and restrained by the princes and parliaments of Europe, it had no effectual check within the Church, nor was there any country in which it was not sometimes practically felt.

It is more difficult to determine, how far the Pope was held at any particular period to be personally absolute in matters of faith. No doubt, disputed points were perpetually referred to his decision, and the decision was considered as final. But, on the other hand, there have been Popes at various times, who have incurred the charge of heresy from very faithful Catholics. Now the very suspicion of error presumes the fallibility of the person suspected, at least in the opinion of the accusers; and in the affair of John XXII. and the process against Boniface VIII., we have not observed that the friends of those Popes denied their liability to error. Again, in somewhat later times, in the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, we find it a principle admitted by both parties, that a Pope might

*On the Personal
Infallibility of
the Pope.*

* Even by the more moderate and acknowledged claims of the Popes, all benefices in the possession of Cardinals, or any of the officers of the Court of Rome; those held by persons who happened to die at Rome, or within forty miles from it; and all such as became vacant by translation, were *reserved*. The invention of mental reservation demanded the more refined ingenuity of the sixteenth century; it is ascribed to Leo X., or at least, to his predecessor. Respecting provisions, we may refer to the history of our own Church, to see with what pertinacity the battle was fought, and how the statutes enacted against them were perpetually confirmed, and perpetually eluded or violated. We may observe, however, that the Kings of Europe were not uncommonly neutral or lukewarm in this quarrel; the Pontiffs were sometimes found more tractable than the chapters, and a concession seasonably made to the former might become the means of reciprocal advantage. Again, we sometimes find the Universities on the side of the Pope—not from any abstract conviction of his right, but because his appointments were often more judicious, more encouraging to the hopes of learned men, than those of the Ordinaries, who usually chose their own relatives or dependents. The Popes had *procurators* established in England, and probably in all other countries, to look after their interests; and the fury with which they pursued them during the fifteenth century, is strongly depicted by Giannone, lib. xxx. cap. 6.

† The Council of Sardica in 347 (not a General Council) allowed a bishop, deposed by his neighbouring prelates, to appeal to the Bishop of Rome—it likewise permitted this last to send legates, to re-examine the case together with those prelates. . . . These decrees (if they be genuine, which Mosheim sees reason to doubt), prove that the power of deposition was not then exercised by the Roman bishop, but by the provincial synods; but they also indicate a disposition in the western clergy even thus early to distinguish the prelate of the imperial city, and to confer greater power on him than on any of his brethren. This inference no one can reasonably dispute, neither can any one reasonably infer more than this from the canons in question. See Dr. Cook, *Historical View of Christianity*, book iii. chap. ii.

‡ The object of the 'Oath of Fidelity' to the Pope, taken by the higher clergy on their admission to benefices, was to bind them—that henceforward they would be faithful and obedient to St. Peter, the apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to the Pope and his successors; that he should suffer no wrong through their advice, consent, or connivance; that they would maintain and promote all his rights, honours, privileges, and authorities, and resist and denounce all attempts against him.

be deposed on conviction of heresy ; whence we may draw the same inference respecting other periods of Papal history. The claim of infallibility was not preferred in the deliberations at Florence, though conducted in the presence of the Pope and his Court, and entering very deeply into the subject of papal authority ; nor was it advanced at any later period in the same century. So that, however clearly it might be deduced from the general expressions of various bulls and constitutions, and even though it should have been asserted by some individuals and acknowledged and maintained by others, yet it would be too much to account it among the authorized pretensions of the Roman See*. Howbeit the doctrines which proceeded from the chair (*ex Cathedrâ*) were seldom disputed ; and the Pontiff might forget the possibility of error in the reverence which awaited and embraced his most questionable decisions.

Again, in the regulation of the moral duties of the faithful, the same searching hand interposed with the same rigorous inquisition. A general power of dissolving obligations was claimed by the successors of St. Peter, and they applied it in various manners, as suited their policy, or, it might be, their conscience—sometimes in divorcing a prince from his queen, sometimes in separating a nation from its monarch. The most sacred oaths were annulled with the same ease, which dispensed with the slightest promise ; and as there were many who profited, or might hope to profit, by that papal prerogative, and as it was made familiar by constant exercise, so were there few who cared to question it, however shameful the ends to which it was sometimes applied.

It is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that, besides the eternal punishments denounced against sin, there are also temporal penalties attached to it, which are still due to the justice of God, even after he may have remitted the former ; and that those penalties may consist either of evil in this world, or of temporal suffering in the next and intermediate condition of purgatory. It is also an article of faith, that a satisfaction in their place has been instituted by Christ, as a part of the Sacrament of Penance, and that the jurisdiction of the Church as exercised by the Pope, extends to the remission of that satisfaction. The act of remission is called an Indulgence ; it is partial or complete, as the indulgence is for a stated time or plenary, and the conditions of repentance and restitution are in strictness annexed to it. Through this doctrine, the Popes were, in fact, invested with a vast control over the human conscience, even in the moderate exercise of their power, because it was a power which overstepped the limits of the visible world. But when they proceeded, as they did soon proceed, flagitiously to abuse it, and when, through the progress of that abuse, people at length were taught to believe, that perfect absolution from all the penalties of sin could be procured from a human being ; and procured too, not through fervent prayer and deep and earnest contrition, but by military service, or by pilgrimage, or even by gold—it was then that the evil was carried so far, as to leave the

* The claim to infallibility is not contained in the Creed of Pius IV., compiled out of the Canons of Trent, which Roman Catholics consider as the most accurate summary of their faith ; and the Universities have generally opposed it. But it has been maintained (as a matter of opinion, however, not of faith) by many distinguished individuals, among whom the most notorious is, perhaps, Bellarmine. It is mortifying to humanity to observe the genius of Pascal stooping to draw elaborate distinctions between infallibility in matters of *faith* and in matters of *fact*, and exhausting itself to prove, that, though the Pope does really possess the former, it does not follow that he is also invested with the latter—that is, that though he cannot err in judgment, he may possibly be deceived by falsehood !

historian doubtful, whether any thing be any where recorded more astonishing than the wickedness of the clergy, except the credulity of the vulgar.

We shall recur to this scandal, for it was the immediate cause of the Reformation; but it is proper to remark that, in the general picture which has been drawn of Rome's spiritual despotism and pride, some features had already been effaced before the approach of Luther. From the death of Boniface VIII., the colours had been gradually, though insensibly, fading away. The dependent Popes of France sustained the character of Gregory VII. and Innocent IV. with feebleness and degeneracy. The profligacy and rapacity of their Court began to dissolve the hereditary spell, and withdraw the sacred veil, which had hitherto concealed their real weakness. During the Schism, the rival Antipopes railed against each other, while they covered themselves with crimes; and the nations who were appealed to, as arbiters of the dispute, could scarcely fail to detect the unworthiness of both parties. In the Councils which followed, some principles were advanced and established which, though still too narrowly limited by inveterate prejudices, were at least subversive of the absolute monarchy of the Pontiff. When the Councils were dissolved, and the duty of convoking others successfully eluded by the Popes, the Court of Rome, liberated from that terror, once more plunged into debauchery, more shameless, yet more notorious, than the abominations of former days; and the various scandals of the tenth century were surpassed by Innocent VIII., by Alexander, and Julius, in an age of comparative civilization. It is true, that in its pretensions the See had abated nothing of its ancient arrogance, and we have observed what awe it was sometimes capable of inspiring even in its decay. But the light had broken in; the slow, yet irresistible hand of knowledge had commenced its labours; and the basis of opinion, on which alone the spiritual despotism rested, was already shaken and shattered.

III.—The effect of successful usurpation is to aggravate ambition, and the more disproportionate the success to all reasonable hope and calculation, the wilder are the schemes which take their rise from it. The spiritual despotism of the Pope transcends any exhibition of human power described in any history, until we approach the surpassing magnitude of his temporal pretensions. The design of Gregory VII. was the most daring imagination of human ambition. To establish the Chair of St. Peter as the source of *all* power, secular as well as pastoral, civil as well as ecclesiastical—to subject all kings and all governments to the crozier of an unarmed, aged priest—to regulate the politics of the world by the annual meeting of a Senate of Ecclesiastics, under the eye of that autocrat—to dispose of all countries and of all thrones—to create monarchs and then to suspend, or depose them—to sport, as it were, with all that is sublime and mighty in earthly things—such was a scheme beyond the boldest conception of secular pride; and it was engendered, where alone it could have found any nourishment, in the breast of a monk.

*The claims of
Rome to uni-
versal Temporal
Supremacy.*

The temporal supremacy of the Pope was projected *not* in the darkest moment of superstition and barbarism; it was promoted during a period more enlightened than that in which it originated; it reached the height of its triumph during the latter part of the thirteenth century, when Frederic II.

had given an impulse to literature, when Dante was earning immortality; and, but for that French intrigue which transplanted Papacy for a season into a foreign soil, it might have advanced still farther; it would not, at least, have receded so soon. Yet its fate must naturally have followed the decline of the spiritual authority of the See, since it had absolutely no other foundation than that; and as it was of later origin, and more obviously insulting to every man's reason, so was its overthrow more rapid and more complete. Yet its latest pretensions were not unworthy of its ancient insolence; and the presumption with which it distributed, in the fifteenth century, kingdoms and oceans, and continents, is recollected with astonishment even by the Catholics themselves—since the Catholics now for the most part admit, that that branch of the Pontifical authority was an indefensible usurpation.

Nevertheless, it found much support in the temporary interests of the great; it held forth a plausible pretence in the pacific objects which it professed, and it was really instrumental in conferring some benefits on mankind. Probably there is no Court in Europe, in which the Papal right to dispose of thrones has not at some time been virtually recognized. It was never disputed by any prince, who found his immediate profit in its acknowledgment—when the crown was *offered* by the Pontifical hand, the validity of the donation was never questioned; and thus did sovereigns sharpen for the chastisement of their rivals, a weapon, which was so easily turned against themselves.

In the worst periods of feudal government, a mediatory influence over the various chiefs of the European Republic, vested in the head of the universal religion, if exercised with moderation, with disinterestedness, with discretion, according to the rules of Evangelical charity, might have conferred the most substantial blessings on society; and since the Papal interference was sometimes so regulated, it had not been wholly destitute of advantage. Divisions have been healed, wars have been prevented, crimes have been punished, justice has been honoured, tyranny has been checked, by the arbitrary decrees of the Vatican—the Popes were, upon the whole, as wise and as virtuous as the princes around them; and when we consider the holy ground on which their government professed to stand, it is very shameful, that they were not much more so. But the good which they conferred was confined to evil times, and even then it was alloyed with much mischief. The motives of their mediation were at least as commonly found in anger or ambition, as in religion or philanthropy; and it may be questioned whether the political benefits which proceeded from it, such as the establishment of a liberal party in Italy, and occasional restraints on kingly despotism, were not rather the consequence, than the design, of their policy. The means employed by their ambition were sometimes lower than the ordinary level of political immorality. To rouse subjects against their sovereigns is a detestable method of effecting even a beneficial purpose—yet it is common and human; but to arm the hands of children against the thrones and lives of their parents is a policy suggested by the counsels of Satan.

IV.—It was a position advanced by Pierre d'Ailly, that a Council General had no power over the Pontifical dignity, which was of divine authority, but only over the abuse of that dignity. 'And on that account (he adds) the monarchical system of the Church is tempered by an admix-

The Constitution of the Church.

ture of the 'aristocratical and democratical principle*.' In the balance of the Roman Catholic polity, the Papal despotism was, in fact, mitigated by two restraining powers—whatever may be the political denominations properly belonging to them—the College of Cardinals and General Councils; by the former as the electors, the constitutional counsellors and coadjutors of the Pope; by the latter as the states-general of the Universal Church.

Until the edict of Nicholas II. in 1059, the name of Cardinal† possessed little dignity or distinction, and the body had no existence, as an acknowledged branch of the Ecclesiastical system. The important share which it then received in the election of the Pope was confirmed and extended by the further regulations of Alexander III.

Rise and Progress of the Cardinals.

The consent of two-thirds of the body was made sufficient for a legal choice; and the College was at the same time enlarged by some considerable permanent additions. To conciliate the higher class of the clergy, the priors of some of the principal churches were enrolled among the electors—the acquiescence of the inferior orders was secured by the admission of the cardinal deacons—and the civil authorities, who represented the interests of the people, were appeased by the elevation of the seven Palatine judges to the same office. Indeed, it is from this time, more properly than from the decree of Nicholas, that we should date the foundation of the Sacred College.

That event marks an important epoch in the history of the Church; not only because it secured the more peaceful election of the Popes, and prevented those perpetual broils and schisms which arrested the flight and dimmed the eye of Papacy; but also because it introduced a new element into the Ecclesiastical polity, which gradually expanded, and acquired in process of time a great and unforeseen preponderance.

We observe an edict published by Honorius III. in 1225, for the especial protection of the cardinals from all personal assaults and offences; and other proofs are afforded of the tenderness with which the monarch-popes had begun to regard the *Court of St. Peter*. But the first public occasion, which was turned to the aggrandizement of the College, and

* 'Et idcirco status monarchicus Ecclesiæ regimine aristocratico et democratico temperatur.' A position laid down by Gerson on the same subject is not at variance with this—'Ecclesiastica Politia ita est monarchica, ut non mutari possit in aristocraticam aut democraticam.'

† The sixty-first dissertation of Muratori treats 'De Origine Cardinalatus;' and he arrives, through much learning, at the probable conclusion, that the term was in Italy originally applied to all, whether bishops, priests, or deacons, who were immoveably, and in perpetuity, established in a cure or dignity, in contradistinction to the Vicarii, or temporary and occasional ministers. Parochial churches (originally called Baptismal) and Diaconis (pious houses for the reception of the poor, mendicants, infirm, and strangers) were respectively administered by the priest and deacon: and when he was fixed therein for life, he was called Cardinal. The term implied the *stability* of the office—its dignity and superiority was associated with that, and was a secondary accompaniment. So of Bishops. Vacant sees were, originally, often *commended* to some one in the interim, 'donec ibi constitueretur proprius et titularis.' But when the permanent prelate was appointed, he was said to be *incardinated* (incardinari) in the see, and became cardinal. . . . Respecting the subsequent aggrandizement of the Sacred College, we may mention, that Nicholas IV. in 1289, divided the Roman revenues equally between the Pope and the Cardinals (Pagi, Vit. Nic. IV. s. xxii.); and that they profited by the ultra-papal Decretals of Gregory IX. The title of Eminence, in the place of Illustrissimus, was given them by Urban VIII.; but it is an observation of Fleury, (Discours 4me. sur la Discipline,) that their frequent appearance in the character of Legates *a latere*, on which occasions they took precedence of all ecclesiastical dignitaries, and ruled as the representatives of the Pope, contributed more than any other cause to their exaltation.

which raised its members to an ideal level with mere worldly princes, was the first Council of Lyons, held (in 1245) by Innocent IV. From that moment they became essentially distinguished from the rest of the clergy in rank and in pride; and the counsellors and associates of that Power which overshadowed the majesty of kings*, looked down with disdain upon the *petty* bishops† who occupied the inferior regions of the hierarchy. But their prosperity was not favourable to their virtue or their concord. In the discharge of that very duty, which gave birth to their dignity, they disgraced themselves and scandalized the Church by their dissensions; and instead of promptly repairing her loss, they frequently allowed long intervals to elapse, in which she remained without a head, and Christ without a vicegerent upon earth. This had been particularly the case before the election of Gregory X.; and that excellent pontiff accordingly undertook to remedy the evil which had touched himself so closely. And then followed (in 1274) the institution of the Conclave.

The cardinals, after some ineffectual attempts to shake off the constraint thereby imposed on them, presently turned their attention to lay such restrictions on the Pontifical authority, as might still farther enlarge the privileges and interests of the College; and they proposed to make their right of election subservient to this end‡. The Conclaves of Avignon were the first in which the *future* pontiff was invited to bind himself by that sacred oath, which he never hesitated to take, which he never omitted to confirm, and which he never failed to violate. The introduction of that practice demonstrates the power of the Sacred College, as well as its ambition; but in tempting the morality of its masters, and exhibiting itself as a fruitful nursery for Pontifical perjurers, it did not well consult either its own interests, or the honour of the holy See, or the stability of the Church. It is true that the mysteries of the Conclave were not, in those days, very generally divulged, nor did they descend, perhaps, to the knowledge of those ranks in society, which are most sensible to the scandal of great crimes. But as knowledge gained ground, and as the reformers of the Church multiplied, while its enemies grew more powerful, those secret iniquities were brought to light, and the tales of former days were accredited by the deeds of the existing generation. In truth it would seem, that, in the general corruption of the hierarchy of Rome, the disorders of the Court excited louder and more general indignation, even than those of the monarch of the Church,

* Louis II. seems, from Pagi (Vit. Nicolai, s. iii.) to have been the first emperor who held the Pope's bridle; and Nicholas I. (858—867) the first Pope who exacted that proof of inferiority—*humillima illa Imperatoris Ludovici erga Nicolaum Pontificem obsequia refert Anastasius Bibliothecarius.*

† *Episcopelli* was the term by which the cardinals loved to designate prelates who had not received the hat—according to Nicholas of Clemangis. About the same time, Pierre d'Ailly in his Discourse *De Ecclesiæ Auctoritate* (Opera Gersoni, vol. i. p. 901) takes some pains to make out, that the cardinals are the legitimate representatives of the Apostles, the Council of the representative of Christ. . . . We should never forget that Pierre d'Ailly was a reformer, and decidedly opposed to the high-papist party.

‡ The professed object of the oath taken in conclave previously to the election of Eugenius IV. was 'ad conservandum statum ecclesiæ Romanæ et monarchiam ecclesiasticam cum cardinalium dignitate; qui cum sint lumina et ornamenta prope Papam, Sedem Apostolicam illustrantia, et columnæ firmissimæ sustentantes ecclesiam Dei, cum Romano Pontifice eadem, ut membra suo capiti, concordia insolubili debent esse conjuncti.' On the same occasion it was stipulated that the formula 'de consilio fratrum nostrorum' should be changed to 'de consensu;' that the Pope should not create new cardinals without the consent of the old; that half the revenues of the Church should be paid to the College, &c. See Pagi, Vit. Eugenii IV.

The relative situation and reciprocal influence of the Pope and the Sacred College were such, in appearance, as to promise a moderate government under a limited monarchy: they were such, in reality, as to present, under that show, an imperious and oppressive despotism. According to ancient Canons, and the Constitutions of later Councils, the Consistory was the permanent Senate of this Church; and its sanction was, in strictness, required to give force to all the decrees of the Vatican *. It was likewise restricted by the same laws to a fixed and moderate number—none were to be admitted into it except men of mature age, acknowledged learning, approved piety; and its morality (the surest source of ecclesiastical power) was provided for by severe injunctions. These regulations were, indeed, for the most part disregarded; nevertheless the body did in fact contain many elements of strength. It consisted of individuals, most of whom were in the flower of life, practised in the affairs of the world, familiar with courts, possibly connected with princes; subtle in the conception of their designs, unscrupulous in the pursuit of their interests. On the other hand, the Pope was commonly enfeebled by age†. His election was placed entirely in their hands; and by their perseverance in attempts to make this power the means of abridging his authority, they sufficiently manifested their inclination to do so.

*Relative Power
and Interests
of the Pope
and Cardinals.*

Where then was the point of their weakness? How was it, that their design was so effectually frustrated? Of the reasons, which may be mentioned for their failure, the first was the corruption of the College itself; for without that, all the various resources of the Pope could not have upheld his predominance. The second was the power which he possessed over the persons and property of the Cardinals, which reached to imprisonment, spoliation, torture, and even death, and which was not uncommonly exerted. But this required at least a pretext for its exercise; whereas that to which we next come, was of easy and universal operation. The patronage of the Church was placed to a great extent at his disposal; and where menaces might not prevail, the most certain method of persuasion remained to him. Lastly, he enjoyed the prerogative of multiplying the members of his refractory senate, and thus creating a majority subservient to his views—for the laws, which had been enacted to restrain that power, do not appear at any time to have been seriously observed. By the dexterous application of these various means, the Pontiff was enabled to command with great certainty the suffrages of the Consistory.

Notwithstanding the restraints which the Cardinals endeavoured to impose upon the Papal authority, they were zealously united in its defence, whenever it was assailed from any other quarter; because their own dignity was essentially involved in the majesty of the See. This was sufficiently proved by the proceedings of Constance and Basle: and on the same principle it became the *General Councils*. object of those two Councils to reform the Court, no less than the Chair, of St. Peter. The real extent of the lawful power possessed by those august bodies was furiously contested both in that and succeeding ages; nor has it yet ceased to be a matter of speculative differ-

* The Cardinals were the *Brothers* of the Pope, and edicts were published by their counsel.

† The average reign of the Popes during the first fifteen centuries was of about seven years.

ence among Roman Catholics. Again, the decrees which they published for the reformation of the Vatican were, for the most part, eluded, or openly outraged. But the effects which they really produced on the destinies of Papacy, though less immediate, were more durable, and far more extensive, than their authors had contemplated. The association of powerful and learned laymen in ecclesiastical deliberations, the habit of free discussion, the popular constitution of the assemblies, especially the last, the public promulgation of anti-papal principles, and the practice of contending with Popes and deposing them, produced a deep impression in every quarter of the Catholic world. Rome alone might fail to comprehend the warning, or affect to despise it; and she reaped the fruits of her blindness or perversity. For the truth is, that the springs which were then opened, had they been allowed by the Papal policy to take the course originally marked out for them, would but have cleansed away some of the corroding abuses of the See, and thus increased its strength; but being dammed up and diverted by a short-sighted opposition, they were indeed repressed for the moment—yet they presently broke forth in another quarter with redoubled violence, and finally swept away the mansion, which they were at first intended to purify.

The sketch which is here presented of the general constitution of the Roman Catholic Church, and of its tendency to decline during the two centuries which preceded the Reformation, should be filled up by some of the less perceptible portions of the fabric; that we may not wholly over-

look the subordinate machinery, which alone enabled it to subsist so long. First, then, let us mention that popular principle in its construction, by which it threw open its benefices and dignities, even the Apostolical Chair, to every rank in society. It appealed to the ambition of all mankind: nor was this any faithless lure, to excite

the industry of the faithful, and then to elude their hopes; so far otherwise, that several of the most eminent and honoured among the Pontiffs were of ignoble and even unknown origin. As long as the level of ecclesiastical morality approached at all near to the pretensions of ancient purity; as long as virtue and piety were held requisite for high offices, no less than talents and learning—so long the emulation awakened among Churchmen was serviceable not only to the prosperity of the Church, but to the general welfare of society, and the general interests of religion. But when, in the first stage of sacerdotal corruption, other paths were discovered of ascending the spiritual pyramid*; when the bigot or the parasite was found to reach the summit more surely than the man of holy and humble, yet upright, industry—then it became probable that men so promoted would throw scandal on the Church; and it was certain, that they would confer no benefits on mankind. But when at length, in days of deeper iniquity, the most odious vices formed, as it were, the morals of Rome, ecclesiastical ambition became very closely connected with anti-Christian principles, and avarice, licentiousness, and perfidy, too frequently prepared the way to the throne of St. Peter. Howbeit, the talent and ingenuity of men were still stimulated by the splendid prospect, and all the energies of the mere intellect† were still exercised and abused in the service of the Church. Nor

* It is said, that the tops of pyramids are accessible only to two descriptions of animals—the eagle and the serpent. Both have found their imitators in the history of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy.

† The great mass of business, carried from all quarters to Rome, so as to make it for

yet were they always abused—the love of letters was sometimes a passport to the most elevated dignities, and the instrument which was destined to overthrow the See was sometimes employed to illustrate and support it. Nicholas V. and Pius II. eminently proved the great advantage which the democratical principle *might* confer upon the church, even in its worst age. But the occasional success of genius, of even learning, was insufficient for the support of a religious establishment. The springs of morality were poisoned. The vices of the ecclesiastics were those least pardonable, and least pardoned, in the ecclesiastical character. The contrast between the demeanour of the Hierarchy and its professions and purposes was too violent and too manifest. The tutelary spirit of piety had deserted the temple, and its gates were thrown open to invite the invasion of the Reformer.

The hand of arbitrary power must sometimes be seen as well as felt, in order that its commands may always be obeyed. And the Bishop of Rome soon discovered the policy of visiting the more distant communities of the faithful by envoys and emissaries. In earlier ages, the pomp and haughtiness of his Legates sufficiently represented the pontifical presence. They awed the assemblies of the great, and insulted the dignity of princes. In succeeding times, when reason and heresy raised their heads, and it became necessary to exert a more direct and searching influence over the people, the Mendicants started into existence, and spread like a cloud over the face of Europe. These men were zealous and indefatigable ministers of a master, whom, if many served from interest, many revered with honest enthusiasm. They practised great austerities; they preached with fervour, sometimes with eloquence; above all, they eagerly embraced and appropriated the scholastic erudition of the day: and thus it was that by feeding the false appetite for fallacies and subtleties, they converted learning, which was the natural enemy of Papacy, into its useful instrument. Among the accidents (if accident it can properly be called) which conspired to prolong the dominion of Rome, the most fortunate was assuredly this, that the first efforts of reviving reason were so perplexed and tortuous, as to be capable of serving falsehood no less effectually than truth.

The Scholastic system was in due season supplanted by a better—but the influence of the Mendicants fell still earlier into decay: because they insensibly departed from the show of moral excellence, which had recommended them to popular favour; because the Pope had gradually converted them into the instruments of his cruelty, and the representatives of his avarice. It was thus that they lost their hold on the affections of the vulgar. For the lowest classes of mankind, though they may sometimes judge wrong, will always feel right; their principles may be shaken by the example of their superiors, but they will always tend to rectitude; and if they ever show favour to any crime or baseness, it is because they are deceived, not because they are depraved.

The discipline of the Church of Rome *practically* permitted the utmost latitude of rigour and laxity. In the same community, under the same government, within the walls of the same monastery, licentiousness was tolerated and austerity encouraged. The lordly Prelate transcended the pomp of secular luxury; the genuine disciple of St. Francis disclaimed all right even to the *use* of earthly possessions. The Cardinal and the Carmelite were united by the same ministry, by devotion to the same

such matters the school of Europe, drew thither men of talents and ambition, and gave them occupation, and consequently engaged them in the defence of the system, by which they profited.

master, by the same professional hatred of heresy. But this startling inconsistency was not without its use, nor perchance without its design. For since, in the diversity of the human character, the vulgar may either be dazzled by pageantry, or moved to reverence by mortification and humility, so also the exhibition of the one was a guarantee against contempt, that of the other against envy and reproach. So that the Church, in this respect truly universal, had space and occupation for every character and every faculty; whilst it nourished a multiform and incongruous progeny, who confuted (while at the same time they confirmed) the most opposite accusations. The poverty of the Mendicant, and the piety of the Missionary, redeemed in public estimation the wealth and vices of the Hierarchy.

We pass over the maxims of policy usually ascribed to the Vatican—to confound the marks of filial and feudal obligation; to accept respect as obedience, and offer counsels as commands; to obscure the limits of temporal and spiritual jurisdiction*; to keep all disputed rights in suspense

* Though, in the progress of this work, the author has purposely abstained from any particular notice of the ecclesiastical affairs of England, in the belief that they are intended to form the subject of a separate history, yet the following remarks on the nature of one branch of spiritual jurisdiction, as exercised in this kingdom, having been kindly furnished him by a legal friend, are too valuable not to be accepted and inserted with gratitude.

It is asserted in several of the old law books, that the spiritual jurisdiction within the English realm is derived from the king, and that such jurisdiction, when exceeded, is subject to the control of the king's temporal courts. The latter assertion is of course true at present; the former perhaps relates to a question of words rather than of fact. If the Church in early times claimed the authority, and the king assented to the claim, the result might be stated as an act either of obedience or of favour on the part of the crown.

With respect to one particular subject matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the wills of deceased persons, and the disposition of the goods of those who died intestate—its origin has been the occasion of much controversy. The question relates simply to personal property. A freehold interest in land was, in early times, with a few exceptions, not subject to the will of the dying owner. The superior lord's rights, as they existed during the vigour of the feudal institutions, would have been prejudiced by permitting such a power of devising. The restriction was only to be evaded by a transfer of the property, during the owner's life, to a person who was to hold it subject to particular purposes to be declared by will; and the courts of equity, by a proceeding which seems to have originated with the ecclesiastical chancellors, compelled the party so holding to apply the estate as the will directed, treating the matter as a question of conscience. The statute passed in the thirty-second year of the reign of king Henry VIII. first gave the direct power of devising freehold interests in land. But a devise deriving its validity from the provisions of this statute has been always considered as a conveyance of the property, not a designation of the heir. It prevents the land from being inherited *at all*. This distinction, although it may appear rather technical, leads to many practical results of importance; and it is a point in which the English law differs from the civil law. But it is here sufficient to state that devises of freehold estates are in no way the subject matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Even where a will contains a disposition of both realty and personalty, the authority of the spiritual courts operates only so far as the will affects the personalty.

The present authority of the spiritual courts over the personal property of deceased persons amounts to this. If there be a claim to establish a will, it is to be proved before the spiritual court; that is, the spiritual court determines whether it be a valid will of the deceased. The recognition of the validity is technically expressed by saying that the executor proves the will, or obtains probate, which is granted by the court. The authenticity of the will, as to personalty, cannot be directly questioned in the temporal courts, after probate has been granted; nor can it be asserted there, before probate is granted. If there be no executor named in the will, or if the executor named will not or cannot act, the spiritual court gives the administration (or disposal) of the effects to an administrator, who is to administer according to the directions of the will. Again, if there be no will, the spiritual court invests an administrator with the power of administering.

and perplexity, so that the greater craft might never want pretexts for encroachment; to crush the obstinate and gain the mercenary; to plunder the subject without offending the vanity of the prince; to manage by treaties those who had been insulted by bulls; to provoke war and mediate

'This jurisdiction of the spiritual courts is certainly very ancient. Authorities have been produced to show that, by the Saxon laws, the probate of testaments (*) was given by the old county courts. The bishop and the sheriff sat together in these courts, as presidents. A charter of William the Conqueror separated the ecclesiastical court from the civil; giving to the former the cognizance of suits prosecuted *pro salute animæ*. But testamentary questions are not expressly mentioned. In the second year of the reign of Richard the Second, the law of William the Conqueror was established and confirmed; and it was directed by the king's charter that no matters of ecclesiastical cognizance should be transacted in the county courts. This re-enactment seems to furnish evidence of the spiritual authority having fallen into desuetude, so far as regarded the courts. Whether or not it had been originally understood, at the time of William's charter, that wills were matter of spiritual jurisdiction, it is clear that the question had been raised before the time of Richard the second. For by a charter of king Henry the first, the king's tenants (who were the suitors in the county courts) were enabled to dispose of their personality for the good of their souls. It can scarcely be doubted that this was effected by the activity of the clergy; and, even if we could believe that they had been at first unconcerned in the matter, it was quite certain that they would instantly apply such an enactment to their own purposes. Probably, therefore, the charter of Richard the second was at once interpreted to apply to testaments. And, on the whole, it seems that this is the epoch to which we ought to assign the undisputed jurisdiction of these courts in testamentary matters. This history of the origin of the power explains and accounts for the opinions of most of our old lawyers, that the probate of wills came to the ecclesiastical courts, not by ecclesiastical law, but by devolution from the temporal law of the realm, or, as they express it, by the custom of England. And it receives strong confirmation from the fact that, by the local custom of some particular manors, acknowledged by the English law, the probate of wills and the granting of administration belongs to the court baron or manor court. And a power of the same sort belongs, in some boroughs, to the mayor, as to the goods of the burgesses.

'That the disposal by will of a dying man's goods is a matter relating to the good of his soul, is a truth in no other sense than that in which every earthly act has a relation to the spiritual welfare of the agent. But a will, being frequently an act performed shortly before death, might, by a natural association, be connected most closely with the eternal destiny of the testator. Besides which, the Roman Catholic doctrines asserted the dependence of the fate of the departed soul upon the intercession of the living. Now this intercession might be purchased from the clergy, by an application of the goods of the deceased. From these causes, the will was asserted by the ecclesiastics to be a matter of *peculiarly* spiritual interest. When this was acknowledged, it must have been, according to priestly logic, a very plain inference that the disposal of the goods of a man who left no will, was a matter in which the clergy, for the sake of his eternal interests, were bound to interfere. It was beyond the skill of the priests, or at any rate of those whom they had to influence, to distinguish between the motive and the result; so that a man, whose property had been applied to pious purposes without his own consent, was thought to derive some merit from the application. Again, it was thought highly important that a part of the property should be applied to the performance of religious rites, for the good of the soul of the deceased; the clergy were the persons most fitted to ensure such an application. Hence the ordinary (or spiritual judge) had the absolute disposal of the intestate's property; and this, according to Lord Coke, was a power previously exercised by the kings of England. But, in the thirteenth year of the reign of Edward I. a statute was passed (commonly called the statute of Westminster the second), by one of the provisions of which the ordinary was bound, as far as the goods extended, to satisfy the debts of the intestate (b). Hence, says Lord

'(*) Originally, the form of bequeathing personal property extended only to a part; the law regulated the distribution of the remainder.

'(b) Cum post mortem alicujus decedentis intestati, et obligati aliquibus in debito, bona deveniant ad ordinarium disponenda, obligetur de cætero ordinarius ad respondendum de debitis quatenus bona defuncti sufficiunt, eodem modo quo executores respondere tenerentur si testamentum fecisset. Cap. 19. Lord Coke says that this was only an affirmation of the common law (2nd Inst. 397). It however was so far a new enactment that it put a decisive end to any question on the point. Many enactments of the same statute are clearly intended to settle disputed rights.

peace—such were the ordinary rules of its government, and they are best exemplified in the exploits of its most honoured champions. But there is one peculiarity in the construction of its power, to which sufficient attention is not always directed. Every one has perceived, how it towered above all earthly principalities, and veiled its sublime front in the most inscrutable mysteries of the spiritual world; but few have observed the real secret of its strength, which lay in the devotion of the lowest ranks of mankind. This general conquest over the affections of the vulgar was no doubt greatly facilitated by the general ignorance; but it was achieved through the zeal of the inferior clergy: and if in some degree ascribable to the peculiar character assumed by the Romish priesthood, it was no less effectually advanced through their plebeian condition and humble manner of life.

According to the literal interpretation of the New Testament, Christ is the only sacrificing priest, as he is also the only sacrifice; thus, likewise, is he the only mediator between God and man. Hence it followed that the proper character of the ministers of his religion is essentially different from that of the Jewish or Pagan priests. The prerogative of the latter was to offer the sacrifice to God, and to intercede with him for the sins of the people. It is the office of the former to interpret and dispense his word, to be the *stewards* of his mysteries, and to point out the only path through faith to salvation—and such were the earliest ministers of the Christian Church. But it was not very long before the *elder** insensibly assumed the loftier office of the Hiererus, or Sacerdos, and affected the expiatory, and, at the same time, the mediatory character. Such were the priests of the Eastern Church—*μεδίται*, Mediators—no less than those of the Western; and we are at no loss to perceive what an access of reverence and autho-

North, what was formally found very beneficial to the ordinaries, began to be very troublesome, which obliged them to put the administration into other hands, taking security to save them harmless from suits. This, however, did not entirely put an end to the ordinary's trouble; for the persons named by him were considered merely as his servants or attorneys. But a statute, passed in the thirty-first year of the reign of Edward III. provided that the ordinary should depute the next and most lawful friends of the intestate to administer his goods; and it gave the minister so appointed power to act in his own right. A statute, passed in the twenty-first year of Henry VIII., enacted similar provisions for the case of a will, where the executor should refuse to act. The power of the ordinary was thus limited to deputing an administrator; but he had still some choice in the selection; for he was entitled to elect as he pleased where persons of equal proximity to the deceased made claim. The ordinaries are said to have availed themselves of this power, by appointing such as they expected to find most obsequious; and they further derived an advantage from calling the administrator to account for the overplus, which they insisted upon his applying to pious uses for the good of the deceased's soul. At last, the temporal courts of law decided that the ordinary, after granting administration, could not exercise any authority over the administrator in his disposal of the property. This shifted the dangerous power to the hands of the administrator absolutely. In the twenty-second year of the reign of Charles II. a statute was passed to prevent this mischief. By this act, the method in which the administrator is to distribute the personality is pointed out. By these successive steps, the power of the spiritual authority has been almost reduced to the exercise of a limited discretion in the appointment of a deputy, who is to act according to prescribed rules. The ecclesiastical courts have ceased, for some ages, to be any instruments of power to the Church, for good or for evil. Their share in the distribution of justice is very limited; but they are still characterized by the peculiarity of their forms of process; and by their total departure from the rules of evidence which prevail in the courts of common law.

* The original meaning of the word Priest (Presbyter) is 'Elder.' This subject is very well treated by Archbishop Whately, in his 'Errors of Romanism,' book ii.

rity accrued to them through the change. They were supposed to be alone initiated in the mysteries of the faith—they were supposed to be in more immediate communication with its divine founder—they were supposed to influence, if not actually to administer, the judgments of Heaven. But we must also observe, that, if such a character was well calculated to overawe an ignorant age, or the ignorant classes in any age, it was sure to be stripped off, whenever any intellectual independence should be exercised, and to be accounted among the impostures fabricated by an artful priesthood for the delusion of mankind.

We shall readily acknowledge, that all sacerdotal influence is vicious and dangerous, except that which is acquired by the religious and moral excellence of the priest: yet even the highest qualities will often miss that end, when the condition of the pastor is very far removed above that of his flock. And thus was it the profoundest policy of the Roman Church to maintain a faithful ministry of the same origin, the same language, almost the same habits with the people. The ecclesiastical chain extended through every gradation of society, till it was folded round the Apostolical throne; but it was that lowest link, which, being fixed in a substantial support, gave firmness and tenacity to the rest. To possess some habits of familiarity with those entrusted to his guidance; to approach them without constraint, to be received without diffidence; to have the same thoughts, the same expressions, the same sympathies; to observe the birth of sin; to watch the workings of remorse; to distinguish the moments proper for censure, or consolation; to be near at hand in times of doubt, or sickness, or domestic calamity—these, and such as these, are advantages peculiarly belonging to a plebeian clergy. Such an order of pastors, under the superintendence of a vigilant hierarchy, may at all times be made serviceable to the best purposes of religion; and it diffused many spiritual blessings, even in the most secular ages of Rome. But to the Church—the external and human establishment—it was the very origin of strength, and principle of vitality: it was the root which spread underground in secrecy and silence; while nations and their princes worshipped under the golden branches, and gathered the bitter fruit which sometimes fell from them.

*Advantages of
a Plebeian
Clergy.*

The very corruptions in the ecclesiastical system were for a season serviceable in rivetting that influence. Auricular confession, the various abuses of penance, the adoration of the Host and the *attributes* ascribed to it, all furnished additional instruments to the clergy; and as long as they were used with moderation, extended their dominion. But it is ever the mistake of the usurper to despise the people, whose confidence he has deceived or insulted; and the error is seldom discovered till the moment for correcting it has passed by. It was thus with the Hierarchs of Rome. They increased the measure of degradation and imposture, till they exhausted the affection, and then the patience of mankind. And it was the last excess of their wickedness and folly to make the inferior clergy their accomplices, and thus to poison the only wholesome fountain of their own authority.

*Serviceable
abuses.*

The above outline of the constitution of the Roman Church represents it not such, perhaps, as it is sometimes painted in the theories of its advocates; but such as it is really and long existed in its practical operation on society. Nor will it seem strange to any reflecting mind, that that Government, which was, in appearance, and in fact, the most perfect despotism ever conceived by the mind of

*Popular foundation of the
Roman Despotism.*

man, should be found at the bottom to rest on a popular basis. Even in civil governments there are instances of the same anomaly; but in an empire, essentially and peculiarly the empire of opinion, the support of the multitude was not so much the only source of strength, as the only principle of existence. If the Roman Church had been more evangelical in doctrine, more consistent in discipline, more moderate in pretension, it might have appealed with greater safety to the reason of mankind. But as it appealed to their ignorance, to their earliest and deepest prejudices, so was it, that it urged the irresistible predominance of authority—the inviolable holiness of antiquity,—all those principles and all those motives, which awe, when they do not irritate, the human understanding. Nevertheless, the appeal, howsoever insidiously made, was still an appeal to the mind: and thus was it seductive and universal. And so long as it found hearers and believers; so long as it retained its hold, by whatsoever means, on the devotion of the people; the dominion of Rome was not less substantial, and more secure, than if the sword had raised or upheld it. But from the moment that the spiritual bond was loosened, the mere worldly fabric, having no longer any element of coherence, subsided in progressive decay and dissolution.

SECTION II.

On the (I.) Spiritual Character, (II.) Discipline, and Morals of the Church.

I.—The Roman Catholics assert with great truth, that their Church has preserved, through the most perilous times, the essential mysteries and tenets of the Christian faith. It is with reverence that we have received them from her hands, and with gratitude that we acknowledge the inestimable obligation. Yet the most zealous Catholic must be contented to share that praise with the schismatics of the east. The same treasure has been guarded with the same fidelity by the Church of Greece; and would thus have been equally perpetuated, if the purity of the Roman creed had been corrupted by the barbarian conquest. But while those rival churches may divide the merit of having transmitted the apostolical doctrines to the latest generations, there is this difference in the manner of that tradition—the one has transmitted them such as she received them from the highest antiquity, not daring to violate by any important innovation the integrity of the pristine faith; the other augmented her confession by some articles, which were left by the discretion of early times to the liberty of private judgment. We have endeavoured (in the Thirteenth Chapter) to indicate the sources whence many of those innovations proceeded. We shall now remark upon one or two others, which, though of distant origin also, did not acquire any general, or at least any very perceptible, prevalence till a later age*.

According to the original system of penance, it was inculcated, that

* It was a general, but not quite correct, opinion of the early reformers, that the Scholastics had invented the new Dogmas, and the Monks the new practices. But it is quite certain, that the immediate causes of the insurrection against Rome were the later corruptions in her doctrine—just as most of the edicts of Constance and Basle were levelled against the later innovations in her discipline.

transgressions could be expiated by prayer, fasting, and alms—there was no period in the history of the Church, in which *pious works* were not held efficacious to redeem sin, and imposed for that purpose, either directly, or by a partial substitution for bodily mortifications. To this circumstance many holy structures owed their origin, many poor-houses and hospitals—the Xenodochia, Nosocomia, Gerontocomia, &c., of the ancient establishment; and these works were considered satisfactory to God. This system was gradually corrupted, and fell, especially in the western nations, into great disorder; when Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, published, about the year 680, his celebrated Penitential. By the instructions herein delivered, the clergy were taught to distinguish sins into various classes, and to judge them according to their nature, to the intention of the offender, and other circumstances. The Penitential likewise pointed out the penalties proper for every sort of offence; prescribed the forms of consolation, exhortation, absolution, and set forth the duties of the Confessor. (Mosh. Cent. vii. p. ii. ch. iii.) This new discipline, though of Greek origin, was eagerly embraced in the Latin churches, and it was immediately corrupted. The method of redemption of penance was presently reduced to a regular system: in the place of so many days of fasting, so much alms were to be given; or so many psalms sung, or so many masses celebrated, *by others*, who were to be rewarded for the office; or so much money to be paid down. The number of the Penitentials was increased, and their character altered, according to the caprice of individual confessors; and, in spite of some attempts * to repress the abuse, pecuniary redemption became more and more common, and presently almost every sort of penance had its fixed price in gold. It may seem needless to add, that the clergy (the *Servi Dei*) easily proved themselves to be the properest objects of these eleemosynary contributions, and that a great proportion of the wealth, so expended, flowed almost directly into the treasuries of the Church.

These, however, were only corruptions of the antient penitential system, they did not effect its entire destruction; but that result was afterwards brought about by the abuse of indulgences. An indulgence, as a mere relaxation of canonical penance,

*Gradual changes
in the Peniten-
tial System.*

Indulgences.

* Muratori (Dissertat. 68), from whom several of these remarks are borrowed, cites the following as the 26th Canon, Concil. II. Cloveshoviensis, A.D. 747. 'Sicuti nova adinventio, juxta placitum scilicet propriæ voluntatis suæ, nunc plurimis periculosa consuetudo est, non sit eleemosyna porrecta ad minuendam sed *ad mutandam satisfactionem* per jejunium et reliqua expiationis opera a Sacerdote Dei indicta,' it is ordained, that alms are to be so offered, that the person of the Penitent may not be wholly spared. The vicarious recitation of Psalms was at the same time prohibited, as well as other abuses. This Council was held by the Archbishop of Mayence, not forty years, perhaps, after the death of Theodore. About twenty years earlier, Gregory II. (Epist. 13.) addressed to Leo the Isaurian the following vigorous description of ecclesiastical, as contrasted with civil, discipline. 'Ubi peccaverit quis et confessus fuerit, suspendii vel amputationis capitis loco, evangelium et crucem ejus cervicibus circumponunt, eumque, tanquam in carcerem, in secretaria sacrorumque vasorum æraria conjiciunt, in Ecclesiæ Diaconia, et in Catechumena alegant, ac visceribus eorum jejunium oculisque vigiliis et laudationem ori ejus indicunt. Cumque probe castigaverint, probeque fame affixerint, tum pretiosum illi Domini Corpus impartiunt et sancto illum sanguine potant; et cum illum was electionis restituerint ac immunem peccati, sic ad Deum purum insontemque transmittunt. Vides, Imperator, ecclesiarum imperiorumque discrimen, &c.' (The passage is cited by Giannone, Stor. Ital. lib. iii. cap. vi.) It was not till the eleventh age, that the practice of flagellation became common, and it was then that St. Dominic, surnamed *Loricatus*, the friend of Peter Damiani, acquired his celebrity. He could discharge by stripes in six days the penance of a hundred years.

existed as early as the days of Cyprian; and it was not till the council of Clermont, that the discharge of a single duty was substituted for all that was due, or might hereafter be due, to the penal authority of the Church. When people thenceforward found it so easy to release themselves at once from the antient burden of redemption, they became clamorous; to receive, what the Pope, on sufficient consideration, was never reluctant to grant. We shall recur to this subject immediately: in the mean time, it is very true, that there existed from time to time many ecclesiastics, even in the worst age of the Church, who exclaimed against the *abuse* of that papal prerogative,—against the indiscriminate distribution and open venality of indulgences. But we have not perceived, that any argued on the false *principle* on which they were founded; it was not then made a reason for their condemnation, that they disparaged the efficacy of Grace; and perverted, if they did not wholly overthrow, the doctrine of salvation through the merits of Christ alone.

The existence and nature of an intermediate state naturally awakened the speculations of the early Christians; but the subjects were long left open to the curiosity, the vanity, or the piety of contemplative individuals—these were not restrained by any ecclesiastical edicts, and impunity yet attended the profession of opposite doctrines. Among the Greeks the question was not afterwards pressed to any practical system or inference. It is true, indeed, that a certain opinion was selected and sanctioned as that most probable, and was apparently inscribed among the authorized tenets: but it was at no time recommended to the peculiar reverence of the faithful; still less was it converted into an engine of ecclesiastical government. But during the iron ages of the Roman Church, the same inexplicable question assumed a much more definite and durable shape. Differing from the Greeks, who considered the immediate abode of the departed to be one of obscurity and discomfort, the Latins boldly lighted the penal fire of purgatory, and gave a substance, a locality and an object to the timid and distrustful speculations of the early Christians.

It is the modern doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church* ‘that there is a purgatory; and that the souls imprisoned there are aided by the prayers of the faithful, and the acceptable sacrifice of the altar.’ But in this matter, it is not so important to ascertain what has been, at various times, the outward *profession* of the Church, as to remark the consequences which have practically flowed from the dogma, and influenced the happiness and morality of mankind. For the history of the Church is not a lifeless record of its Canons and Confessions, but a display of their operation, whether for good or for mischief, whether in their use or in their abuse, upon the Christian community. The consequence, which presently followed from the establishment of a place of temporary punishment, or purification, for departed souls, was, that the successor of St. Peter assumed, through the power of the keys, unlimited authority there. By indulgences, issued at the discretion of the Pope, the sinner (in the theory, the repentant

* Founded on the Canons of Trent.—It is frequently asserted to be the doctrine of that Church, that the *fund*, whence the above forgiveness is drawn, is composed of the supererogatory merits of the saints, (added to those of Jesus Christ,) which are inexhaustible; and such, indeed, it is clearly laid down by St. Thomas Aquinas (see Mosheim, Cent. xii. p. ii. c. iii.) Modern divines disclaim this opinion, as at variance with the great doctrine of justification—and this is not the only instance of salutary change, which has purified the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church during the last three centuries.—May such changes be multiplied!

sinner) was released from suffering, and immediately passed into a state of grace. As long as these indulgences were granted with discrimination and reserve*, the ill effects, which they occasioned, do not often meet the eye of the historian. But as soon as they were turned into mere instruments of papal ambition, and as such were not only promiscuously scattered over the world, but also extended in character to a plenary remission, they became simple manifest means to poison the morality of the faithful.

Thenceforward, their *nature* could scarcely be further corrupted; for the only proof, which was now required of the sinner's spiritual mortification and amendment, was his willingness to perform a single act. But on the character of that act, that is, on the *object* of the indulgence, it still depended, whether the subversion of the principle of evangelical repentance was to be made subservient to the seeming advantage of the world, or obviously instrumental in aggravating its misery.

The object of the indulgence was changed repeatedly; yet never so changed, as to take the guise of philanthropy. First, it was the recovery of the Holy Land and the extirpation of the infidel. Then from the general foe of Christ it was turned against the spiritual adversaries of the Catholic Church; from the spiritual adversaries of the Church it descended to the temporal enemies of the Pope. It next assumed a more innocent shape (if superstition could ever be innocent), and summoned the obedient pilgrims to enrich, on stated Jubilees †, the apostolical shrines of Rome. Lastly, it degenerated into a mere vulgar, undisguised implement for supplying the necessities of the pontifical treasury‡,—and it was in this last form, that it at length aroused the scorn and indignation of Europe.

The profane and even blasphemous expressions, by which the emissaries of the Vatican recommended their treasures to popular credulity were tacitly permitted by the authorities of the Church; yet we shall not detail them here, nor impute them to any others, than the individuals who uttered them—they may repose in the same oblivion. But it is proper to transcribe a specimen of the indulgences which were publicly sold in the beginning of the sixteenth century, because they were the authorised pro-

* Baronius (Ann. 847. s. iv.) boasts the moderation of the indulgences granted in those days, and instances one (*trium annorum et trium quadragenarum*) given under Leo IV. Even as late as the eleventh age there are proofs (as Muratori observes) of similar discretion in the directors of the Church. And it is proper to mention, that Gregory the Great, in his Chapter on Purgatory (*Dialogorum*, lib. iv. cap. xxxix.), expressly limited its operation to venial and very trifling offences (*de parvis minimisque peccatis hoc fieri posse credendum est*), such as mere vain and leisurely discourse, immoderate laughter, or an error in unimportant matters proceeding from ignorance. He adds, moreover, that thus much is certain—that no one will obtain any purgation even from the least offences, unless he merit, by his good works here, to obtain such remission there.

† In the Jubilee of 1300 'Papa (Boniface VIII.) innumerabilem pecuniam ab iisdem recepit; quia die et nocte duo Clerici stabant ad Altare Sancti Petri tenentes in eorum manibus rastellos, rastellantes pecuniam infinitam.'—*Gulielmus Astensis Ventura* (an eye-witness) *Chronicon Astense*, cap. 26. ap. Muratori. Again, in the Bull of Clement VI. for the jubilee of 1350 are these words—'Et nihilominus prorsus mandamus Angelis Paradisi, quatenus animam illius a Purgatorio penitus absolutam in Paradisi gloriam introducant.' See Gianuone, lib. xvii. cap. 8.

‡ It should be recollected, that the sale of indulgences was faintly countenanced by the corresponding enormities of civil legislation, according to which, in somewhat earlier times, every crime had its price. The Church in every age should, in some degree, be judged according to the principles of that age,—yet in such wise, that we never lose sight of that one great and unchangeable standard, by which the actions of a Christian ministry must, in every age, be measured.

ductions of the Church. The following is the translation of that which was circulated by Tetzel:—

'May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee and absolve thee, by the merits of His most holy passion. And I, by his authority, that of His blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and of the most Holy See, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee first from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; and then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be, even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the Apostolical See*. And as far as the keys of the Church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory on their account; and I restore you to the Holy Sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism; so that, if you should die now, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the Paradise of delight shall be opened. And if you shall not die at present, this Grace shall remain in full force when you are on the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' This indulgence, in spite of the ambiguity of one or two expressions, is nothing less, when fairly interpreted, than an unconditional permission to sin for the rest of life; and as such it was assuredly received by those classes of the people, for which it was chiefly intended, and whose morality is peculiarly confided to the superintendence of the clergy. And thus was it, that the destiny of the Church was accomplished.

However easy the acquisition of pardon (for the moderate price of *Private Masses*, indulgences placed them within the reach of the lowest orders), still many neglected to profit by the facility, and were accordingly consigned to the penal fire. Yet even thus they were not removed beyond the power and mercies of the Church†. It was inculcated, that the prayers of the living were efficacious in the purification of those departed souls; but that their release was most speedily secured by the sacrifice of the altar. Hence arose in early times‡ the practice of offering masses, both public and private, for that purpose; and, as these too had subsequently their price in gold, the piety of the survivors was taxed to redeem the transgressions of the dead—so various were the devices of the Church, to render tributary the weaknesses, the virtues, even the natural affections of the faithful. The sale of private masses was a fruitful source of revenue to the clergy, especially to the monastic orders, and that likewise was one of the abuses first proscribed by the eloquence of Luther.

When Innocent III. gave the sanction of a General Council to the

* The translation given by Beausobre (*Hist. Reform.* liv. i.) here differs slightly from that published by Dr. Robertson (*Hist. Charles V.* b. ii.); but not so as to make any important change in the sense of the whole passage.

† Gerson, however, (*De Indulgentiis*, vol. ii. p. 351,) admits, that it is a question *ad stramque partem probabilis*, whether the keys have such power in purgatory, as to remit the punishment of a venial fault or excommunication, committed or incurred during life. This doubt of the Chancellor must have made him unpopular in the monasteries. He asserts, in the same place, without any hesitation,—'Indulgentiæ ad pœnas ex corruptione nature non extendunt.'

‡ We find it proclaimed by the Protestants at Augsburg (1530), that there is no instance of private masses in ecclesiastical history earlier than the time of Gregory the Great. Mosheim is contented to assert, that manifest traces of them may be found in the eighth century, though it be difficult to decide whether they were instituted by public law, or introduced by private authority. . . . We are not aware of the existence of any earlier public regulation on this subject, than the 43d Canon of the Council of Mayence, held in 813, and this is expressly prohibitory,—'No priest shall say mass alone.'

Roman doctrine of the Eucharist, and distinguished it by the name of Transubstantiation*, he not only secured its universal reception in the west, but also countenanced the superstitious practices which flowed from it. It appears to have been during his pontificate, that the custom was introduced of elevating the Host after consecration. The use of the bell to signify to the people to prostrate themselves, while the Holy Sacrament was passing, is ascribed to an ordinance published in 1201, by Guy Paré, the legate of the same at Cologne. And that it may be shown how early this practice was supported by the direct authority of the See, and how widely it was thought expedient to extend it, we may mention that Honorius, the successor of Innocent, addressed an epistle to the Latin prelates of the east, in the Patriarchat of Antioch, in which he instructed them to oblige the people to *incline*, on the appearance of the Host†. In that age, and at that distance from the centre of orthodoxy, it was not held advisable to inculcate the necessity of absolute genuflexion. A simpler act of devotion was deemed sufficient to recognize the divinity of the consecrated elements.

The sufficiency of the Sacrament administered in one kind only is by many considered as an immediate inference from the doctrine of transubstantiation, since the bread, when converted into the body of Christ, of necessity contains his blood; so that, the object of the sacrifice being thus satisfied, the communication of the cup may be safely retrenched, as a vain and superfluous ceremony. At what precise period this change in the practice of the Church (it was maintained to be no more than that), was introduced, we cannot pronounce with certainty‡; but its antiquity was pleaded by its defenders at Constance and Basle, and it may be ascribed, without any great error, to the beginning of the thirteenth century. We may consider it as completing the list of those peculiar observances, which the Church of Rome has thought proper, on her own infallible authority, to impose upon her adherents. Probably the motive for this innovation was to add solemnity to the mystery, by excluding the profane from perfect initiation, and at the same time to exalt the dignity of the priesthood, by giving them some exclusive prerogative, even in communion at the Lord's table. Nevertheless, even with that view its policy was extremely questionable; it was founded on the ignorance of preceding ages; it had no foresight of the character of those which were to come. And thus it proved, that, after the lapse of some few generations, men were rather shocked by the public, practical disregard of one of the plainest instructions delivered in the Gospel, than edified by the spectacle of sacerdotal usurpation. The innovation was too rash, too openly at variance with an express command, intelligible to the lowest classes of the vulgar, and sacred with

* The following is a part of the celebrated Canon (Can. i. Lat. Concil. IV.) in question—'Una est fidelium Universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus; cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, *transsubstantiatis* pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina,' &c. &c.

† Fleury, l. lxxviii. s. 24. The Institution of the Festival of the Holy Sacrament or Body of Christ, another early consequence of the universal establishment of Transubstantiation, is generally ascribed to Robert, Bishop of Liege—who is said to have been moved thereto by the pretended revelations of a fanatical woman, named Juliana. The event took place in the year 1246. Mosh. Cent. xiii. p. 2, chap. iv.

‡ We have not observed that it was formally and universally established by the highest ecclesiastical authority, till it attracted the attention of the Council of Constance.

all who thought their Bible more venerable than their Church. Accordingly we have observed, that the deprivation of this privilege, so clearly granted by Christ to all believers, was the grievance which united the discordant sects of the Hussites—the restoration of the cup was the manifest, incontestable right round which they rallied. To this extent too, they were successful ; and their success afforded the first example of any usurpation having been wrested from the hands of Rome by the open rebellion of her subjects.

Neither was there any one among the peculiar tenets or observances of Rome, which so taxed the ingenuity of her advocates, as the retrenchment of the cup. This perplexity is attested by the records of Constance and Basle ; and it deserves particular remark, that Gerson, in his very elaborate treatise against the Double Communion, discloses the source of his difficulty in this simple complaint. ‘There are many laymen among the heretics who have a version of the *Bible in the vulgar tongue*, to the great prejudice and offence of the Catholic faith. It has been proposed (he adds) to reprove that scandal in the committee of reform.’ That scandal was as old as the heresy of Peter Waldensis ; but the practice which it offended certainly grew up in much more distant ages, nor was it peculiar to the Church of Rome. As early as the seventh century the appropriation of the Scriptures to the use of the priesthood was a practice generally established throughout the east*, and the Latins speedily adopted (if they had not already enforced) a precaution so necessary for preserving the unity of the Church and concealing its abuses. It was authorised by the Council of Toulouse in 1229 ; but the spirit of independence nevertheless gained ground. From the time of Wiclif the unhallowed veil was gradually withdrawn ; curiosity was more keenly excited, as it had been more tyrannically repressed ; the invention of the press increased the facility of possessing the sacred oracles ; and before the preaching of Luther, the *scandal*, which had been deplored a century earlier by the orthodox reformer of the Church, had made very general progress amongst the educated classes, in almost every nation in Europe.

Those prodigious impostures, which in the eyes of Laurentius Vallat† surpassed the impiety of the Pagans, and which were ascribed by Gerson to the phantastic somnolency of a decrepit world, were continued with unrestrained temerity, even to the days of Erasmus. The impostures were the same, which had so long been employed to delude the people of Christ—but the people were changed. A spirit of inquiry was spreading over the surface of Europe, and it was seen and felt by all, except the monks and bigots, to whom alone it was dangerous. But these persevered in the same blind path of habitual fraud and momentary profit, which at length conducted them to the precipice, whither it had always tended.

Certain other unscriptural practices, long inherent in the Romish system, never had flourished with greater luxuriance, than at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The abuse of images had been carried at no period to

* See Chapter XXVI., p. 607.

† *De Donatione Constantini*. ‘Nostri Fabulatores passim inducunt Idola loquentia ; quod ipsi Gentiles et idolorum cultores non dicunt, et sincerius negant, quam Christiani affirmant.’ The passage of Gerson is,—‘Mundus senescens patitur phantasias falsorum miraculorum, sicut homo senex phantasiatur in somno ; propterea sunt habenda miracula valde suspecta.’ Both these passages are cited by Semler. The detection of the artifices practised upon Jetzer at Berne, for the confirmation of the Dominican opinion respecting the immaculate conception, created a notorious scandal ; which assisted in preparing the path for Zuinglius.

a more unpardonable extent. The popular adoration of the saints had never deviated farther from the professed moderation of the Church*—relics had never been approached with a reverence more superstitious, or one more directly encouraged by the priesthood†. The pomp and order of the ceremonies had been at no time more entirely at variance with the character of a spiritual religion. Indeed, some of the festivals which were instituted or revived during the fifteenth century, seem designedly established to turn away men's minds from the substance of Christianity to vain formalities, or wicked fables. And in this place it will be proper to instance, more particularly, in what manner the highest ecclesiastical authorities were supplying the spiritual necessities of the faithful, at the very moment when the cry for reformation was resounding (in various notes indeed, but with general concord) from one end of Europe to the other.

The first regulation for the 'Exposition of the Holy Sacrament' was published in 1452, by the Pope's Legate in Germany, at a Council held at Cologne; and the expressions of the edict‡ are entirely worthy of its object. If a comet appeared (as in 1456), or the country was ravaged by inundation or pestilence (as happened twenty years later), the Pope of the day immediately pressed to offer his indulgences to all who should celebrate the feast of the Holy Sacrament, or of the Immaculate Conception—to all who should thrice repeat the Lord's Prayer, or the Angelic Salutation. About the end of the year 1480 Sixtus IV. was invited to settle a dispute between the inhabitants of Perugia and Sienna, on a very remarkable subject. The former were accused of having obtained fraudulent possession of the nuptial ring of St. Catharine, the hereditary property of the latter, her compatriots. The object was holy; and its sanctity was enhanced (as a grave historian§ informs us) by its various virtues, frequently experienced by the faithful, especially that of reconciling conjugal differences. This quarrel was prolonged for some time under Sixtus and his successor.

Later Festivals, Disputes, Controversies, &c.

In the 'Book of Conformities' between the life of Jesus Christ and that of St. Francis, the fanatic is exalted to the level, if not above the level, of the Saviour. To complete the resemblance, the former carried about with him the marks of the five wounds of Christ; and the belief in these *stigmata* was enjoined to all the faithful by Alexander V. But, in the age following St. Francis, the same miraculous impressions were claimed, on the same authority, by the female impostor of Sienna||. And when

* The following is the doctrine of modern Roman Catholic Divines:—"That the saints reigning with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men: that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them and to have recourse to their prayers, help and assistance, to obtain favours from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, who is alone our Redeemer and Saviour." Alas! ask the peasant of Romagna or the Sicilian mariner for his explanation of the doctrine!

† We refer the reader to Beausobre's account (Hist. Reform. lib. iv. p. 243) of the holy contents of the Church of All Saints at Wittenberg, which had been most profusely enriched by the bulls of Julius II. and Leo X. The whole number of relics exceeded 19,000, divided into twelve classes, according to the dignity of the saints. There were bulls to the effect 'that all who visited this Church on certain days, might retain all property dishonestly acquired, to the amount of twenty-five golden ducats; and that any one who doubted the validity of such indulgencies was *ipso facto* excommunicated, without power of absolution even by the Pope himself, and in articulo mortis.'

‡ See the continuator of Fleury, lib. cx. s. 97.

§ Raynaldus, ann. 1480, n. 44. See Semler, cent. xv. cap. ii., and Bzovius, ann. 1480.

|| It is perhaps proper to mention that the Dominicans likewise claimed the *stigmata* for their patron; but they were compelled to admit, that his extreme humility had prevented him from disclosing them.

Catharine was at length canonized by Pius II., an office was instituted in her honour, of which the hymns affirmed that she had received the stigmata. This was to offer an unpardonable indignity to the Franciscans—for they were jealous of the glory of their patron *, and asserted his exclusive pretension to that intimate sympathy with Christ. Immediately the Dominicans rose in defence of St. Catharine. The office was, nevertheless, denounced to Sixtus IV.; and that Pope presently published an edict, prohibiting any one, under severe penalties, from representing the stigmata of St. Catharine in painting; but he seems afterwards to have retracted his prohibition. These matters took place about the year 1483—it was the same which gave birth to Luther.

About the year 1050, a daily office was instituted to the blessed Virgin, distinguished by seven canonical hours, in a form anciently used in honour of divine majesty; and in the course of the next hundred years the reverence so paid grew into worship. Among the attributes early† ascribed to her, was exemption from original sin; but this opinion was for some time confined to the breasts of a few individuals—it had no place in ecclesiastical ceremonies, or the arguments of the learned ‡. At length, however, about the year 1136, the Canons of Lyons ventured to introduce it into the offices of their Church. St. Bernard immediately opposed that innovation, and attacked the indiscreet zeal of those ecclesiastics. But in the following age, the subject was found to open too large a space for disputation, to escape the polemical zeal of the scholastics—it became, on the contrary, their favourite field of controversy. And since the Dominicans ranged themselves on the one side and the Franciscans on the other §, the contest was heated and perpetuated by monastic jealousy. But it was reserved for the Council of Basle to establish the doctrine, and to excommunicate all who should preach the contrary. A feast was then instituted in honour of the Immaculate Conception, and it received in 1446 the official confirmation of Sixtus IV. || Yet not thus was the controversy composed, nor even the show of concord restored between the contending orders.

Without closely pursuing the inexhaustible subject of monastic dissension, we may mention that a violent dispute arose in this age between the Canons regular and the hermits of St. Augustine, respecting the *dress* assumed by the original monks of that father. The clamour ascended to the Apostolical chair and commanded the attention of Sixtus IV. He published a Bull, in which he wisely enjoined peace to both parties—wisely, but vainly;—for the controversy (as it was called) continued for some time longer to disturb the harmony of those holy brethren.

A difference, respecting the kind of worship, which is due to the Blood of Christ, first arose at Barcelona, in 1351, between the Dominicans and

* Earlier in the same century, an opinion was propagated 'that those who die in the habit of St. Francis, and making profession of the third order, remain only one year in purgatory; because the saint descends thither once a year, and takes away all those of his order to heaven with him.' This proposition was not beneath the notice of the Council of Basle—on the contrary, it was solemnly condemned (May 19, 1443) in the forty-fourth or forty-fifth session.

† As early as the ninth century—some ascribe the origin of the opinion to Paschasius Radbertus.

‡ See Padre Paolo, Hist. Concil. Trident. lib. ii.

§ Semler (Sec. xiv. cap. 1) mentions 1384 as the year in which the controversy on the Immaculate Conception broke out between the rival orders at Paris. In 1387 the faculty censured John de Montesono for maintaining the less exalted opinion—that is, the opinion of St. Bernard and the Dominicans. Nevertheless, the war continued to rage.

|| The bull of Sixtus is given by the continuator of Fleury, lib. cxv. s. 102.

Franciscans. It was renewed at Brixen* in 1462. James a Marchia, a Franciscan, publicly maintained, that the blood, which Christ shed on the cross, did not belong to the divine nature, and consequently was not an object of worship. The Dominicans were roused to fury by an assertion so derogatory to the Redeemer; and the preacher was immediately summoned before the Inquisition. Pius II. made some ineffectual attempts to suppress the controversy; but, finding his authority insufficient for that purpose, he at last submitted the question to a commission of divines. Howbeit, both parties were so highly inflamed, that the doctors were unable to arrive at any decision. At length the Pontiff published a reasonable decree, 'that both opinions might be lawfully maintained, until Christ's vicegerent should find leisure and opportunity for examining the question'—and so the matter rests at this moment.

In 1492, some labourers, repairing the foundations of the Church of the Santa Croce at Rome, discovered what was immediately proclaimed to be the original Inscription on the cross of Christ. The belief was propagated, that it had been sent to Rome by St. Helena, mother of Constantine; and though there was no authority for this tradition, and though the pious Catholics of Toulouse pretended to have possessed the true inscription undisturbed for many ages, Alexander VI. pronounced (four years afterwards) the authenticity of the Roman title, and recommended it by particular indulgences to the devotion of the faithful. On the 29th of May in the same year an ambassador from Bajazet arrived, bearing, as a present to the Pope, the head of the true lance. All the clergy went forth in procession to receive it, and the Pontiff assisted in person at the miserable mummery. Raynaldus likewise assures us (on the authority of Jacobus Rosius) that the sponge and the reed were presented on the same occasion: such were the offerings with which the Infidel insulted the superstition of Christendom, and found his ready agent and most zealous accomplice in the Pope.

But while the spiritual guides of the faithful were thus degradingly employed—while absurdity and imposture seemed triumphant in the Church, and the monks and the clergy were lending, in rivalry, their aid to nourish them—a far different spirit was growing up among those who had sought their instruction elsewhere. Many pious Laymen had already explored the forbidden treasures of Scripture. They had long ago abhorred the vices of the ecclesiastical system; they now discovered that whatever in it was wicked was likewise unfounded in truth. They advanced with increasing confidence towards evangelical perfection, just as the Churchmen were rushing most wildly in the opposite direction, and casting wisdom and piety, as if in scorn and detestation, behind them. Yet was there some reason even in this their madness. The superstitions of Rome were closely connected with her authority, and these exerted on each other a reciprocal and potent influence. The superstitions enslaved the consciences, and thus commanded the *riches* of the faithful; and so they ministered to the Papal power—while, on the other hand, that power

* Semler, cent. xv. cap. ii. While such were the subjects on which monastic absurdity was exhausted, a very different description of nonsense was in vogue, proceeding more directly from the scholastic method—the following may serve as a specimen. One Jean de Mercœur was condemned in 1346 for errors, among which were the following: '(1) Jesus Christ, through his created will, may have willed something, which has never come to pass. (2) In whatsoever manner God wills, he wills efficaciously, that it come to pass. (3) God wills, that such a one sin and be a sinner, and he wills it by his will, at his free pleasure. (4) No one sins in willing otherwise than God wills, that he will, &c. More may be found in Fleury, lib. xcv, s. 37.

established and canonized the abuses : and it had so long been efficient in protecting them, that to many it seemed capable of sustaining them for ever.

II.—*On the Discipline and Morals of the Church.* The severe edicts of Gregory VII. against the concubinage of the clergy, and the disorders which followed them, in no very dissolute age of the Church, sufficiently prove that a law, which offended the principles of nature, could not command observance, even though professional zeal and worldly interest and morality itself pleaded against its violation. And if the severity of that Pontiff for the moment abated the scandal, it was never wholly removed, but continued sometimes to elude, and sometimes to defy the unremitting exertions of Popes and Councils. Inasmuch that, considered only as an instrument of ecclesiastical policy, it would seem that the celibacy of the clergy has produced less advantage to the Church of Rome by the exclusive spirit which it encourages, and the popular influence of which it facilitates the acquisition, than it has done mischief by the reproach and shame to which it has given unceasing occasion*.

Early in the twelfth age, the general relaxation of discipline and morals was deplored by St. Bernard, and it increased in despite of his eloquent denunciations. From that time forward *General Demoralization.* the Reformation of the Church, in its Head and its members, became a subject of frequent mention, and of constant hope or apprehension, according to the sanctity or the worldliness of individual Churchmen. At the Council of Vienne, the particulars of ecclesiastical corruption were boldly exposed, but imperfectly remedied. During the exile at Avignon the pestilence increased ; it was inflamed by the schism, which succeeded ; till at length, whatever still remained of learning and excellence in the Church, combined against its further progress. It is superfluous to repeat the names or transcribe the indignant expressions of those Reformers. The truth of their testimony has never been disputed† ; and one of the few circumstances in the history of the Roman Catholic Church, which has escaped all controversy, is that of its demoralization. The fathers of Constance and Basle having failed to repair the discipline of the Church, it received no improvement during the interval which succeeded ; nor were the examples of Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., or Julius II., well calculated to re-establish the authority of the Canons, or restore the model of antient purity.

* The following Canons of a Council held at Toledo in the year 400, sufficiently show the practice of the Church of Spain, nearly 80 years after the Council of Nice. *Canon I.* 'Married deacons or priests who have not preserved continence with their wives shall not be promoted.' *Canon VII.* 'If the wife of a priest has sinned, he may bind her in his house, and make her fast and chastise her... he should not, however, eat with her until she has done penance.' *Canon XIX.* 'If she be the daughter of a bishop, priest, or deacon,' &c. And again, 'the widow of a bishop, priest, or deacon, who marries again, shall not receive communion, except on her death-bed.' On this subject Guizot has remarked, that the necessity of recruiting an unmarried clergy from the ranks of the laity was one reason for the failure of the Papal scheme of universal monarchy. To have cured its success (he adds), the clergy ought to have been a distinct caste, bringing up their own children to their own profession. But there is much to be said against this opinion. A caste producing itself is a much more separate and distinguishable object for an enemy's aim, than a body which is incessantly recruiting itself from the mass.

† La discipline ecclésiastique (says Bossuet) s'étoit relâchée par toute la terre : les désordres et les abus portés jusqu'aux environs de l'autel faisoient gémir les bons, les humilioient, les pressoient à se rendre encore meilleurs—mais ils firent un autre effet sur les esprits aigres et superbes.' *Histoire des Variations*, lib. xi. s. 294. We might also refer to the celebrated avowal made (in 1522) by Adrian VI. at the diet of Nuremberg.

If there was any country, which at that time had escaped the general degradation, the exception may have been formed by Spain : and Spain is chiefly indebted for that distinction to the morose, monastic austerity of Cardinal Ximenes. That haughty Churchman revived the image of the spiritual champions of early days. Under the habit of a Franciscan, he nourished unbounded ambition, and more than pontifical insolence*. As regent of the kingdom, he possessed great secular authority ; but his religious profession was ever nearest to his heart, and it was his favourite boast, ' that he could bind the grandees to their duty by his *cord*, and crush their pride with his sandals.' The object, on which he was most ardently bent, was the conversion of the vanquished Moors. His impatience permitted no method, except compulsion ; and no fewer than fifty thousand are related to have submitted to baptism, and made their heartless professions of conformity. The triumph was applauded ; the tyrant was feared and imitated ; and his severe court presented a remarkable contrast to the licentiousness of Rome. In the opposite extremities of the moral scale the evangelical Christian will discover, perhaps, an equal departure from the will of the Saviour. That selfish arrogance, which swells and hardens under the garb of religion, is scarcely less at variance with the spirit of the Gospel, than positive sensual sin. . . . Yet both were the inevitable produce of an ecclesiastical system, which was compelled to maintain its hold on the affections of men, by offering, at the same time, encouragement to their fanaticism, and impunity to their vices.

Yet should we be very unjust to the Roman Catholic Church, if we should allow it to be supposed, that she opened no receptacles for the nurture of true excellence—that in her general institutions, especially in her earlier ages, she has overlooked the moral necessities of man—the truth is far otherwise. We have repeatedly observed, how commonly, in seasons of barbarism, religion was employed in supplying the defects of civil government and diffusing consolation and security. The *Truce of God* mitigated the fury of private warfare, by limiting the hours of vengeance, and interposing a space for the operation of justice and humanity. The name of the Church was associated with peace†—and it was a prouder position, than when she trampled on the necks of kings. The emancipation of the Serfs was another cause, equally sacred, in which her exertions were repeatedly employed. In her interference in the concerns of monarchs and nations, she frequently appeared as the advocate of the weak, and the adversary of arbitrary power. Even the much abused law of Asylum‡ served through a long period as a check on baronial oppression, rather than an encouragement to crime.

Cardinal
Ximenes.

Benefits conferred by the Church.

* On one occasion Ximenes opposed the levy of tenths in Spain, though commanded by Leo X., under the pretext of a Turkish war. The Cardinal (should we not rather say the Regent?) informed the Pope, that, unless on the urgency of some very pressing occasion, he would never allow the clergy of Spain, under his government, to become tributary. See Beausobre, *Hist. Reform.* liv. i. It should be mentioned that Ximenes published a Polyglott Bible. Cont. Fleur. l. 119, s. 142.

† The 'Peace of the Church' was first proclaimed early in the eleventh century. The particular edict, which was more formally promulgated at the Council of Clermont, prohibited all private warfare from sun-set every Wednesday till sun-rise on the Monday following, so that four days a week were sanctified from acts of violence. On this occasion, we cannot, perhaps, give the Pope much credit for his motives ; but our question is not with motives, but with facts.

‡ This subject was made a matter of legislation in the Theodosian and Justinian codes.

The duty of charity, during the better ages of the Church, was by no means neglected by the secular clergy, while it was the practice and office of the monastic establishments. And even the discipline so strictly inculcated by the earlier prelates, however arbitrary in its exercise and pernicious in its abuse, was not unprofitable in arresting the first steps and restraining the earliest dispositions to sin. Confession and penance, and the awful censures of the Church, when dispensed with discretion, must have been potent instruments for the improvement of uncivilized society.

The original principles of monachism were entirely guiltless of the evils which flowed from it in later ages. In the *Principles of East*, it was the passion for retirement and contemplation *Monachism.* which chiefly contributed to people the mountains and wildernesses with holy recluses. In the West, it was rather a desire of association for useful purposes, which caused the construction of so many monasteries—schools were connected with their establishment, and whatever impulse was given to the human understanding proceeded from them. In both, they were effectual in drawing off from the virtual exercise of paganism those nominal proselytes, extremely numerous in all ranks of the laity, who concealed, under the profession of Christianity, a lingering affection for the hereditary superstition. It is, indeed, true, that such an institution could not have originated, except in a very peculiar and unhappy condition of society; that it took root and flourished in general demoralization, and public and private misery. But on the other hand; it is equally true, that it operated for some ages with great efficacy in abating the evils out of which it sprang.

The rule of St. Benedict was well calculated to improve the generation to which it was delivered; and the retreats which he opened gave security and employment to multitudes, in the most calamitous period of Christian history. No self-torture or maceration was prescribed to his disciples by that reasonable legislator—those were the inventions of the later and more depraved ages of the Church, when the fanaticism of some was found requisite to counterbalance the profligacy of others. These changes insensibly took place, as the monks departed step by step from the independence of their original profession; first throwing off the character of laymen, and obtaining admission into the ranks of the clergy, by which they became subject to severe oppression from the bishops*; and then gradually escaping from that yoke to the more indulgent, but not less arbitrary, despotism of the Pope. Nevertheless, even during the decline of the monastic principles, some sparks of former virtue were revived by the frequent reformation of the old orders and the establishment of new—some remains of pristine excellence were very long preserved amid the ruins of the system.

If we have been compelled on many occasions to notice the vices of the

It drew a decree from Boniface V. in the seventh century; and in the eighth the Lombard Kings passed some laws to deprive the worst description of criminals of such protection. The Abbots and Bishops were commanded, under severe penalties, to give up such fugitives into the hands of civil justice. Consult Giannone, lib. v. cap. vi.

* See Guizot (Hist. Moderne, Leq. 14. and 15.) from whom some of the above observations are borrowed. It is perhaps too hastily asserted in chap. xiv. (p. 382) of this work, that 'as late as the eleventh age the monks were, for the most part, laymen.' The change had taken place earlier; and though the distinction, such as it now exists, between the monks and the lay brethren, was then first established, it seems probable, that the greater part of the monks were already ecclesiastics, and that the lay brothers were introduced, for the discharge of the inferior and more laborious offices.

Mendicant orders, and to observe how soon they became the zealous agents of the Holy See in all its worst practices and projects, so should we not forget, that the same were for some time the most active ministers of the Church, in the discharge of its holiest offices. It is not without reason, that Roman Catholic writers vaunt the disinterested devotion of the early Mendicants—how assiduous they were in supplying the spiritual wants of the poor, how frequent in prisons and in hospitals, how forward to encounter the fire or the pestilence; how instant on all those occasions where the peril was imminent, and the reward not in this world. They were equally distinguished in another, and not less righteous, duty, the propagation of Christianity among remote and savage nations. We have noticed in a former Chapter the method, by which the Gospel was introduced into the North of Europe, before the middle of the eleventh century. In the twelfth, we observe Boleslaus, Duke of Poland, opening the path for its reception in Pomerania by the sword; and in like manner, both the Sclavonians and Finlanders were prepared for conversion by conquest. Again, Urban III. consecrated Mainhard, an unsuccessful missionary, Bishop of the Livonians, and proclaimed a holy war against them; the Bishop conquered his See, and promulgated at the head of an army the tidings of evangelical concord. The same methods were pursued by Innocent III. But from that time forward we find much more frequent mention of pious missionaries, whose labours were directed to accomplish their great work by legitimate, or, at least, by peaceful means. It may be true, that some of them were satisfied with mere nominal conversions, and that others had chiefly in view either their own advancement, or the extension of the papal sovereignty. But there were likewise many, who were animated by the most admirable motives, and whose exertions, if they failed of complete success, failed not through any want of disinterested devotion.

The missions of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were principally directed to the North of Asia. In 1245, Innocent IV. sent an embassy composed of Dominicans and Franciscans to the Tartars; and a friendly communication was so maintained, that the envoys of Abaca, their king, were present, in 1274, at the second Council of Lyons. Nicholas III. (in 1278) and Nicholas IV. (in 1289) renewed those exertions. John of Monte Corvino, a Franciscan, was distinguished during the conclusion of the century by the success of his labours*; and in 1307, Clement V. erected an Archiepiscopal See at Cambalu (Pekin) which he conferred upon that missionary. Seven other Bishops, also Franciscans, were sent to his support by the same Pope; and this distant branch of the hierarchy was carefully nourished by succeeding Pontiffs, especially John XXII. and Benedict XII. It is certain, that the number of Christians was not inconsiderable, both among the Chinese and Moguls, as late as the year 1370,—and they were still increasing, when they were suddenly swept away and almost wholly exterminated by the Mahometan arms†. Howbeit, the disastrous overthrow of their establishment detracts nothing from the merit of those who constructed it; and it must not be forgotten that the instru-

* He is recorded to have translated the Gospels and Psalms into the language of the Tartars.

† It is certain (says Mosheim) that we have no account of any members of the Latin Church residing in Tartary, China, or among the Moguls, later than the year 1370; nor could we ever learn the fate of the Franciscan missionaries, who had been sent thither from Rome. Yet some doubtful records may seem to prove, that there were Nestorians in China as late as the sixteenth age.

ments in this work were Mendicants, and, for the most part, Franciscans. But during the following age (the fifteenth), there are no discoverable traces of the same spirit; nor can we refer with any satisfaction to the compulsory proselytism of the Moors of Spain, or to those spiritual conquests which immediately followed the discoveries of the Portuguese and Spaniards.

When we reflect on the various excellencies ascribed in the preceding paragraphs to the Papal system, we cannot fail, however unwillingly, to make two observations; first, that they had declined and almost disappeared before the conclusion of the fifteenth century; next, that the greater part of them were only adapted to times of civil anarchy or general ignorance. But are we therefore to suppose, that, even during the reign of Alexander VI., the great Christian community of the west was wholly destitute of religious instruction, or of examples of sacerdotal piety? that the practice of moral justice, or even of Evangelical righteousness, was entirely confined to the sectarians of Bohemia, or of the Alpine valleys? The prospect is not quite so gloomy; the destinies of man were not thus abandoned by his Creator.

(1.) Under the respectable name of Mysticism much genuine devotion was concealed, and many ardent and humble aspirations poured forth before the Throne of Grace. Since the introduction of the supposed works of Dionysius into the west (in the ninth century), the flame has ever continued to burn with more or less of intensity or languor, of purity or the contrary, according to the principles of the age, the policy of the Church, and the character of the prevalent literature. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, we may search, indeed, almost in vain for any useful records of the piety of the Mystics—in the latter, some traces, which they have left, are strongly marked by visionary enthusiasm, and bear no comparison with the more rational devotion of Anselm. In the twelfth, the age of Abelard and his scholastic disciples, they faintly* opposed the progress of that barren system of speculative morality, which grew out of the theology of the Schoolmen, and which spread with such freezing prevalence in the succeeding century. Yet, while those heartless teachers (the ‘Patriarchs of Pedantry’) were classifying the duties of man, distinguishing moral from theological virtues, minutely subtilizing and dissecting, and subdividing their subdivisions—while they were creating subjects for angry dispute, rather than holy meditation, and labouring in vain to resolve the difficulties which themselves had created, the Mystic Moralists formed an opposite, and not inconsiderable, party in the Church. They ventured openly to combat the positions of the Scholastics; and they were followed by those with whom religion addressed the affections, rather than the reason, and who more willingly abandoned themselves to an ardent emotion, than engaged in an intellectual controversy. Thus numerous supported, they commanded the respect of their adversaries; and some of these even deigned to write commentaries on the Book of the Areopagite.

Though not less opposed to the fashionable ‘casuistry’ of the fourteenth age, they were then less active, or at least less prominent; it is probable that they employed that interval in the purification of their own system, and in cleansing away those fanciful absurdities which had covered it with dishonour and ridicule. At least, in the fifteenth century, they again came forward with the show of a far more rational piety than had heretofore

* Mosheim (Cent. xii. p. ii. chap. iii.) mentions the names of a few of their works.

distinguished them: insomuch, that the Platonists of the day strove to reconcile the warm devotion of the Mystical scheme with the plausible ingenuity of the Scholastic, and thus to construct a new and more perfect method of moral theology. It is unquestionable that they comprehended, together with the Platonists, many individuals of deep and ardent, though, it might be, misdirected, piety*, and of the purest simplicity of moral conversation. Yet the age in which they flourished was defective in expositions of Scripture; the Oracles of Truth were insufficiently consulted, or injudiciously interpreted, even by the best among the servants of the Church; and the Book†, by which her pretensions were so soon to be tried, was studied most successfully by her enemies. The merits of the Mystics were not sufficient either to reform, or to preserve, the declining establishment. Their sublime aspirations after the Divine presence removed them too far from the ordinary sphere of human action. In the abstract contemplation, of the attributes of the Deity they lost the power of influencing the counsels of men; and their warm imagination was not controlled by that firm and temperate judgment, which is as essential for the good government of churches, as of empires.

(2.) The real heroes of Ecclesiastical history are those, whose belief and life are regulated by the laws of Christ; and the very circumstance, which constitutes their excellence, ensures their obscurity. They are not without their reward even in this world—but it is not in the enjoyment of renown, or in the hope of worldly immortality. It is in silence, that they perform their offices of charity; it is in secrecy, that they fulfil the commands of their Master; it is in humility, that they exalt their fellow-creatures: and as soon as their peaceful course of usefulness is over, they disappear, and leave no sort of trace or record of their virtues. It is to the proud, the turbulent, the ambitious, to the fanatic or the hypocrite, that the pages of the annalist are principally consecrated; and those whose life has been an insult to their religion, stand far more prominent in the Ecclesiastical picture, than those who have loved and obeyed it. It is not, that many have not existed, even in the worst ages of the Church, whose almost spontaneous piety has supplied its laws and corrected its abuses, and repaired, as far as their private influence extended, the ruins of its discipline—under whose sacred guardianship the treasures of life have been faithfully dispensed, and whose example has given sanction to their instructions. It is not, that even monastic depravity has not been redeemed by thousands of instances of monastic excellence. But it is, that the vices have been registered and blazoned, while the opposite qualities have either attracted no notice, or have generally been so exaggerated, as to revolt our reason and belief. Among the numerous progeny of saints, so venerated by Catholics, so proscribed by Protestants, there have been some examples of pure Evangelical holiness; there have been some cardinals who have dared to deviate from the rule of profligacy; there have been many prelates, eminent for learning and integrity, as the History of National Churches and General Councils sufficiently demon-

* Among the Mystics, Mosheim places Thomas à Kempis, Laurentius Justinianus, Vincent Ferrier, Savonarola, Bernard of Sienna. Among the Platonists, John Gerson, Nicholas Casanus, Dionysius the Carthusian, and others.

† The Bible Divines, who had been declining from the thirteenth century, were now become nearly extinct. Books of Sentences and Sums of Schoolmen were the principal objects of study; and when, in 1515, Erasmus published his edition of the New Testament, and thus 'laid the egg which Luther hatched,' the clergy exclaimed against the act as dangerous, if not impious.

strates. But such characters were far more common among the humble and undistinguished pastors, who were free from the vanity, the enthusiasm, or the ambition, which so often lurks beneath the garb of celebrated sanctity. Yet the eye of the historian is fixed by the austere and wonder-working Saint, by the pompous Prelate, and the intriguing and rapacious Cardinal, while it overlooks the plants which flourish in the lower regions of serenity and fruitfulness. Notwithstanding, it is scarcely too much to affirm, that it was the zeal and piety of the inferior clergy, which so long supported the cumbrous machinery of the Court and Prelacy of Rome. It was their virtues, which sustained the vices of their superiors; it was their humble piety, which enabled mitred apostates so long to outrage the name of Christ. And it was not till the poison had descended to the extremities of the system, and communicated even to the village pastor some portion of its hierarchical malignity, that the Church of Rome reeled to its foundation, and by its weakness and depravity invited and justified the rebellion of its children.

SECTION III.

On various Attempts to reform or subvert the Church.

I.—An attentive consideration of the facts and remarks advanced in the preceding sections will show, that in almost every particular, whether of internal polity, or ghostly authority, or doctrinal purity, or discipline, or morals, the Church of Rome stood lower at the end of the fifteenth century than at any preceding period. There was one circumstance only in which it had gained ground. The temporal power of St. Peter had been exalted into a durable monarchy, and the limits of the sacred patrimony extended and secured, during the last decay of the spiritual fabric. The era of Boniface VIII. was probably that, in which the various pretensions of the See combined with the greatest effect for its aggrandizement. Its territorial domains were then respectable; its clergy were generally exempt from civil jurisdiction; its divine right to worldly power was not universally disputed; its abuses were comparatively inoffensive; its domestic enemies were almost harmless. Then commenced its downfall; and it was precipitated through two centuries of progressive calamity and disgrace. Its constitution, which by the co-operation of the Pope with the Cardinals and General Councils presented the means of regeneration, was suspended and perverted by Eugenius IV. and the succeeding pontiffs. In the pageantry of its ceremonies, in the character of its festivals and its controversies, it receded farther and farther from the soberness of reason and the simplicity of the Gospel: and its moral degeneracy kept pace with its other depravations. On the other hand, the general principles of society were improved, and the laity had begun to shake off the deep slumber of obedience and conformity. The corruption was universal, the danger imminent; many even among the prelates of the Church were not insensible to either; and some, who might perhaps have tolerated the scandal, were moved by the peril. Thus there grew up a large party within the Church, who proclaimed the necessity of Reform.

The necessity of some reform having aroused the wisest and most virtuous among the churchmen, questions might naturally have grown up among them, to what extent, and on what principles their work ought to be conducted? Yet on this subject no important difference appears to have arisen. A sacred barrier was placed before them

*Nature of
the Reform at-
tempted by the
Churchmen.*

which separated that, which might be touched, from that, which was inviolate; and it was guarded by irresistible prejudices. On this side lay the field of discipline and temporalities—on the other were the mysterious regions of Faith, embracing all that mass of mingled truth and superstition, which the Infallible Mother had imposed with equal rigour, as equally holy, upon her believing children. Into the former space the Fathers of Constance and Basle entered with some boldness of upright determination; but it had been sacrilege and heresy to have invaded the latter. Hence it arose that the most dangerous wounds were not examined, perhaps not even suspected. 'In a mortal disease lenitives were administered and oil applied*,' and if some outward impurities were feebly remedied, their inward causes were purposely covered from all inquiry with a venerable veil. Thus, while all the genius and learning of the Church were combined to repress the abuses of Pontifical power—while the Pontiff was essaying every art in defence of those abuses—while anathemas were interchanged, and the contending parties seemed to be emulating each other's rancour—no question was for a moment started as to the legitimacy of that power. It was thought much to deny the infallibility of the Pope, to contest his absolute despotism; but his supremacy was as sacred as the Church itself, and the Church was identified with the religion. In this delusion both parties were equally sincere; and though the high Papists were certainly the farthest removed from any consideration of Gospel truth, it must be admitted, that their opponents were almost equally destitute of evangelical principles. The Church was the exclusive object, to which their education, their interests, their prejudices, their enthusiasm, their very piety attached them. Within it whatever was holy and righteous was concentrated. Without it, all was blindness and rebellion and blasphemy; and their belief was not so much, that the Church was founded on the Bible, as that the Bible was comprehended in the Church.

From men with such principles, it was to be expected, that those who pleaded Scripture as an independent testimony of truth—that those who spoke even of truth as independent of ecclesiastical authority, would meet with no sympathy, and little mercy. Accordingly, their advances towards reform were made in the very bosom of orthodoxy. The most frivolous superstitions were rather encouraged, than restrained; no innovation was introduced, which could have startled the bigotry of the most rigid Romanist. Nothing was even remotely intended for change, except the discipline. Yet even this department presented ample employment for the hand of the reformer, had he entered upon his work honestly and fearlessly. Howbeit, even on this ground, unhallowed as it was by any spiritual prejudices, those fathers did not penetrate, in their boldest attempts, to the roots of the evil. They confined their hostility to the abuses which were of modern origin. Their veneration for antiquity, that professional reverence for established practices, which so strongly characterized the clergy of that Church, forbade them to search very deeply or very generally. They endeavoured, indeed, to correct some disorders, which had notoriously grown up during the two or three preceding ages; it was a specious object to abolish the corruptions of Avignon, to repair the ruins of the schism! But they were awed by the holy obscurity of earlier times; and the clumsy forgery of a monk of the eighth century arrested the most enlightened among the doctors of Constance and Basle.

* The Bishop of Segovia addressed this expression to the Fathers of Trent, who, under still more dangerous circumstances, were following the same policy. See Padre Paolo, b. vi.

Nevertheless, the schemes of the reformers, though bearing no proportion to the real emergencies of the Church, were wise as far as they went, and calculated to prolong the existing system. Had they been cordially carried into effect, some useful improvements would have been introduced, some unpopular scandals removed; the most distinguished ecclesiastics would have rallied round the Pope, and the laity would have respected, for a certain time, the concessions and the union of the clergy. But even this imperfect result did not take place. It has been shown with how great pertinacity the Pope and his profligate adherents fought the battle of corruption, and defended every abuse, which was fraught with present profit, and future and early destruction *. In the struggle which divided the Church, the policy of the hour prevailed. The unity of power and design, the keen sense of personal interest, the tyranny of inveterate prejudice, gave the triumph to the less virtuous, the less provident, even the less numerous party; and after the fathers of Basle had reluctantly dispersed, and their creature Felix V. resigned the name of Pontiff, the bark of St. Peter was urged forward by a gale of unruffled prosperity, until suddenly, and soon, and in the moment of most exulting security, it was dashed against the rocks and shattered irreparably.

A circumstance, which may have suspended the downfall of the Church, was the elevation of two Popes (Nicholas V. and Pius II.), whose reputation and pursuits were in harmony with the popular passion for reviving letters. Their personal qualities concealed for a moment the vices of the system, and substituted in public observation the splendour of a literary court. Again, the overthrow of the Eastern Empire, and the danger of Turkish invasion, became powerful instruments for diverting attention from ecclesiastical grievances: and the clamour for reform was, for a while, drowned in specious appeals to the policy of princes, and the enthusiasm of their subjects—but for a while only. The spirit of the age, when once decided and pronounced, can neither be long eluded, nor safely resisted. A little time may be gained: the progress of improvement may be slightly retarded; but it will presently spring forward the more rapidly, as it has been the longer held back. Now, the preceding century (the fourteenth) was one of mixed and conflicting principles; it had not assumed any marked or definite character; and thus the Church marched safely through it, with all its depravity on its head. But in the fifteenth, the principles of society were fixed; the general voice of Christendom proclaimed the necessity of reformation; the high-church dominant party presumed to disobey, or, with equal impolicy, descended to evasion; and through their own perversity they fell. And whether it was, that they were too blind to see their danger, or too obstinate to sacrifice their vices, they fell by a fate, which few will affect to deplore, and which none can deem undeserved.

Howbeit, since the secession of the Protestant communities, a gradual

* It might seem unnecessary to fortify this position by any authority. Yet the opinion of one of the most clear-sighted prelates, who have ever adorned and defended the Roman Catholic Church, may not by some be thought superfluous. 'C'est ainsi (says Bossuet) que dans le quinzième siècle le Cardinal (Julien), le plus grand homme de son temps, en déplorait les maux, et en prévoyait la suite funeste: par où il semble avoir prédit ceux, que Luther allait apprendre à toute la Chrétienté, en commençant par l'Allemagne; et il ne s'est pas trompé lorsqu'il a crû, que la Réformation méprisée, et la haine redoublée contre le Clergé allait enfanter une secte plus redoutable à l'Eglise, que celle des Bohémiens. Elle est venue cette secte sous la conduite de Luther; et en prenant le titre de Réforme, elle s'est vantée d'avoir accompli les vœux de toute la Chrétienté, puisque la réformation estoit désirée par les peuples, par les docteurs, et par les prélats Catholiques.' *Histoire des Variations*, liv. i.

though tardy reformation has been virtually accomplished in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. Its most extravagant pretensions have been generally withdrawn; and if no important change has been introduced into the body of its doctrine, yet the abuse of some of its tenets has been in some places mitigated; and its discipline has been every where amended and purified. When it had lost the half of its dominions, it turned itself to improve and preserve the rest—from the blow which cleft its triple crown, it first began to learn the wisdom of moderation; and to discover in sackcloth and ashes, that its wisest counsellors and truest friends had ever been those, who had warned it to repent and amend.

II. Several learned and pious Protestants have attempted to trace the uninterrupted descent of their doctrines, or at least of some essential portion of them, even from the apostolic times. Great ingenuity and research have been employed for this purpose, partly to make it thus manifest, that the Almighty, while he permitted so much iniquity to be perpetrated in his name, did still nourish in secret his true and perpetual Church; partly, that the perpetual succession of the ministry might not seem wanting to the reformed communities; partly, because the reverence for antiquity, especially in ecclesiastical matters, has a powerful, perhaps an undue, influence on the greater part of mankind. For these reasons very much has been written about the "Lutheranism which was prevalent before Luther;" the unbroken series of "Witnesses of the truth;" the unceasing *protestations* which have been silently breathed in all ages, against the abuses of Rome*.

Attempts to trace the continuity of the Protestant opinions to the Apostolical times.

* This subject has been treated by Bossuet, in the eleventh chapter of his *Variations*, eloquently, learnedly, and of course not impartially: and thus, while he has unquestionably established many of his positions, he has advanced others which are untenable. (1) Respecting the *Albigensis*. He has established that they were wholly distinct from the Vaudois: and that they held many opinions which are condemned by all Protestants. But he has failed in proving their Manichean origin—still more their Manichean doctrines—for to make out this identity he has invented so many *marks or characters* of Manicheism, wholly unconnected with its original and only true mark, the doctrine of the two principles, as to embrace under that name errors entirely dissociated from it. He calls them indeed *new Manicheans*, and admits that 'they had softened some of their errors.' But they had parted with the characteristic error, or, in fact, they had never held it. For the same reason he has failed in confounding them with the Catharists, Bulgari, &c., who were the real descendants of the Paulicians. (2) Respecting the *Vaudois*. He shows the great uncertainty, perhaps the entire vanity, of their claims to a separate descent from the Antenicene Church. He shows that, at their first appearance, their differences with Rome were less numerous and important than they became afterwards: that they adopted some new opinions after their union with the Protestants: that they were the same with the *Leonists* and the *Insabbats*. But he does not establish his assertion, that they were founded by Peter Waldo of Lyons. (3) Respecting the *Bohemian Brethren*. He rightly supposes, that the Hussites were not descended from the Vaudois; and that the 'Brethren' made some doctrinal concessions on their union with the Lutherans. But when he asserts that Huss had no doctrinal difference with the Church, except on the single communion; and that the same was the *only* subject of disaffection with the Calixtines; he has not fairly represented either the one or the other. The 'heresies' of Huss were less bold and numerous than those of Wicliff; those of the Calixtines than those of the Thaborites; and that respecting the cup was the most publicly professed; but it was associated with others less notorious. In the mean time, we must admit, that he has, in our opinion, established his two leading positions; viz., that the Protestants fail in their attempts to prove an uninterrupted succession; and that those whom they claim as their ancestors differed from them in numerous points of doctrine. We might notice some rash assertions on less important points—but our readers are aware that they should be cautious in following Bossuet on his own unsupported assertion—on that *parole*, 'toujours éloquentes' (as Voltaire truly says of it) 'et quelquefois trompeuse.'

It is unquestionable, that so early as the beginning of the twelfth century, some of the Protestant opinions were openly professed, and atoned for by death. And it is equally certain, that, from the preaching of Peter de Bruis to that of Luther, there have subsisted in some quarter or other of the western community various bodies of Sectaries*, who were at open or secret variance with the Church of Rome—who rejected, according to their respective principles, in part or in whole, her tenets, or her ceremonies, or her ministry. It may be doubted, whether the Albigeois, in spite of the crusades of Innocent, and the Inquisition of Toulouse, were ever entirely extirpated. The Vaudois were certainly preserved through the perils of four centuries of oppression. The ashes of Wicliff were not lost in their rough descent into the ocean; and the spirit, which rose out of the funeral flames of Huss, survived to expand in the bosoms of his compatriots.

From this short catalogue we have purposely excluded innumerable denominations of heresy, of which there were scarcely any which did not, in some one respect, or in more than one, anticipate the Confession of Augsburg. The various forms of Mysticism were universally opposed, in their progress as in their origin, to the outward pageantry of the Roman Church. The spiritual Franciscans, who questioned the omnipotence of the Pope, and denounced the corruptions, no less than the wealth, of the Clergy, are even placed by Mosheim among the forerunners of the Reformation. At least, it is certain, that their continued insubordination, combined with such high pretensions to sanctity, had its effect in preparing the downfall of Papacy; and thus they may properly be numbered among the instruments appointed to divide its strength, and betray its fortress by intestine discord to the foe without.

Again, among the sects, which we have mentioned as the more genuine precursors of Luther and Zuinglius †, there was not one which furnished in all respects a faithful model for *their* more perfect reformation. There were points on which they differed from each other. There were points on which they differed both from Roman Catholics and Protestants. There were even points in which they agreed with the former, and fell far short of the subsequent doctrine of the latter. But there were also many articles of essential importance, on which they opposed, with premature independence, their reason and their Bible to the abuses, and even to the authority, of the Church.

Such were the sects, from which the Protestants claim their descent, and to which they are justly grateful for having prepared their path, and set the example of non-conformity. But they sprang up before their season; their imperfect lights were unable to preserve them from error; curiosity and knowledge were yet too scantily distributed among the mass

* It might seem scarcely necessary to remark, that we have frequently, in the course of this work, used the word *Sect* in its original and proper sense—of a body of men united by certain tenets,—the sense in which Tertullian used it (Apol. cap. v.) when he called the whole Christian community *hanc Sectam*. Only it is a common error to connect with this term the idea of *cutting off*; and thus to attach a degrading notion to it. In the same manner, the term *Heresy* (in its origin equally inoffensive), we have commonly applied to those, whom the church has denounced as heretics—without any reference whatever to the nature of their opinions.

† Semler (Seul. xv. cap. iv. p. 218) enumerates a variety of opinions hostile to the Church, in the design to show that Luther was not so much the first who came into the design of vindicating the public Christian religion, as that he trod in footsteps clearly traced before him—so that those are in error, who consider the Reformation as a political, rather than a religious, movement.

of the people to give them a substantial footing *there*; and thus they fell before the established despotism, and shed their precious blood, both as an eternal testimony against the Church, and as the seed of more enlarged principles in a happier age.

In our journey back towards the apostolical times, these separatists conduct us as far as the beginning of the twelfth century; but when we would advance farther, we are intercepted *The Vaudois*. by a broad region of darkness and uncertainty. A spark of hope is indeed suggested by the history of the Vaudois. Their origin is not ascertained by any authentic record; and being immemorial, it *may* have been coeval with the introduction of Christianity. Among their own traditions there is one, which agrees well with their original and favourite tenet, which objects to the possession of property by ecclesiastics. It is this—that their earliest fathers, offended at the liberality with which Constantine endowed the Church of Rome, and at the worldliness with which Pope Sylvester accepted those endowments, seceded into the Alpine solitudes; that they there lay concealed and secure for so many ages through their insignificance and their innocence. This may have been so—it is not even very improbable, that it was so. But since there is not one direct proof of their existence during that long space; since they have never been certainly discovered by the curiosity of any writer, nor detected by the inquisitorial eye of any orthodox bishop, nor named by any Pope or Council, or any Church record, chronicle, or memorial, we are not justified in attaching any historical credit to their mere unsupported tradition. It is sufficient to prove, that they had an earlier existence than the twelfth century; but that they had then been perpetuated through eight or nine centuries, uncommemorated abroad, and without any national monument to attest their existence, is much more than we can venture, on such evidence, to assert. Here then the golden chain of our apostolical descent disappears; and though it may exist, buried in the darkness of those previous ages, and though some writers have seemed to discern a few detached links which they have diligently exhibited, there is still much wanting to complete the continuity*.

* The claims of the Protestant Mountaineers in Dauphiné appear to be somewhat stronger than those of the Vaudois; because (as has been mentioned) neither the worship of images, nor the pontifical jurisdiction was established in France, so early as in Italy—probably not till the middle of the ninth century. Now, as soon afterwards as the year 1025 we have records of the existence, at Arras, of certain erroneous opinions, which were supposed to have proceeded from “the Alpine borders of Italy.” In this case, the interval of silence is reduced to rather less than two centuries: and though this space will seem to many sufficient to destroy all historical ground for asserting an uninterrupted succession, nevertheless, upon the whole, we are disposed to consider it as very probable, that on the sides and under the brows of those desolate mountains there may have existed in every age a few obscure peasants, whom *all* the innovations of Rome have never reached. Different persons will attach different degrees of importance to this result—we therefore refer the curious reader, with great pleasure, to Mr. Gilly’s ‘Memoirs of Neff,’ where the subject is argued with learning and earnestness. At the same time it is proper to mention what those opinions really were which were condemned at Arras in 1025; lest it should be supposed, that they were at variance only with the Roman Catholic Church, and strictly in accordance with apostolical truth. (1.) It was asserted, that the sacrament of baptism was useless, and of no efficacy to salvation. (2.) That the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was equally unnecessary. (It would seem that the objections of the heretics on this point went beyond the mere denial of the change of substance.) (3.) That there was no peculiar sanctity in churches, (4.) nor holiness in the altar. (5.) That the use of bells, &c., to summon the people to worship, was objectionable. (6.) That the sacred orders of the ministry were not of divine institution. (7.) That the Church rites of sepulture are to be ascribed to the avarice of the clergy. (8.) That penance was altogether inefficacious. (This appears to have been an inference from their

When we turn to the history of the Albigeois, we find there still less to flatter our hopes, or encourage our pursuit. For *The Albigeois*. if we adopt the more probable opinion respecting the origin of that sect—that it was engendered by the contrast, so perceptible even to the least instructed, between the character of the Church and the first principles of Christianity—its birth must at least have succeeded the manifest corruption of the Church; nor is there any evidence to prove it more ancient, than the twelfth or perhaps eleventh century. If, on the other hand, we should identify those Dissenters (as some have done) with the Cathari, the Gazari, Paterini, Publicani, and others of the same age, who were collateral branches of the Paulician family, we are not, indeed, any longer at a loss to trace the succession to very high antiquity. It is also true, that the contempt of images, the disbelief in transubstantiation, and some other protestant principles, were faithfully perpetuated in that heretical race. But these attractive characteristics were tainted, more or less deeply, by the poison of Manichæism: and since it is our object to establish a connexion with the primitive Church, we shall scarcely attain it through those, whose fundamental principle was unequivocally rejected by that Church, as irrational and impious*.

If the claim again be reduced from a succession of sects to a series of pious individuals, who in every age of the Church *Mysticism*. may have secretly protested against its abuses and its worldliness, it becomes equally impossible to prove its existence, and to deny its probability. The aspirations of mysticism, sometimes degraded into absurdity, sometimes exalted into the purest piety, have unquestionably pervaded and warmed every portion of the ecclesiastical system, from the earliest æra even to the present. Its perpetual existence alone shows, that in private bosoms, and especially in the abstractions of the monastery, a disaffection towards the ceremonies, towards the grosser abuses, and perhaps towards some of the sacraments of the Church, has been unceasingly nourished, even within its own precincts. But the names of these contemplative and unambitious individuals are, for the most part, lost in oblivion; and even if they were not so, the truth of the Protestant principles would gain little assurance, and their dignity little increase, from so slender, imperfect and precarious a connexion with the apostolical purity.

denial of the efficacy of baptism.) (9.) That alms, vicarious penance, &c., are of no use to the dead (which involved the denial of purgatory.) (10.) That marriage in general was contrary to the evangelical and apostolical laws. (11.) That saint-worship is to be confined to the apostles and martyrs—not extended to the confessors, i. e. holy men, not martyrs. (12.) That church music is reprehensible. (13.) That the cross is not an object of worship, (14) nor the Saviour's image on the cross, nor any other image. (15.) That the orders of the hierarchy are objectionable. (16.) That the doctrine of works (Justitia) supersedes that of divine grace, and every man's hope of salvation lies in his own deserts (see Labbæi Concil. tom. xix. p. 423. Ex Dacherii Spicileg. 2 ed. vol. i. p. 607.) So mixed and various is the substance of those opinions, to which learned writers on this subject appeal with so much satisfaction.

* Manes, a Persian, (the pretended Paraclete,) propounded his system, for reconciling the Magian with the Christian opinions, in the third century. The system was, indeed, original, in as far only as it was a new application of the doctrine of the two principles—but the doctrine itself had been (as we have seen) employed by the Gnostics for the corruption of Christianity, long before the time of Manes. It is for this reason, that we have not bestowed that attention on the system of the Persian fanatic, which it usually receives from ecclesiastical writers. It may suffice to refer the ordinary reader to Moheïm, cent. iii. p. 11. chap. v., and Bayle, Article—*Manichæens*.

Upon the whole, then, it seems impossible to establish on historical ground the theory of an uninterrupted transmission of the original faith from the primitive times to those of Luther. Indications of its occasional existence may be discovered, but no proof of its continuity. Yet is this no disparagement to those faithful witnesses, who were called into existence in the iron days of the Church. They bequeathed to their more fortunate successors their principles and their example. Nor were they in their own times without influence, nor even without peril to the pontifical predominance. Innocent III. did not despise their infancy: he beheld it, on the contrary, with such anxious apprehension, as to divert the engine, with which he was armed for other purposes, to their destruction. He knew the real character of his own despotism, and the secret of its weakness; and while, by his clamour for the crusades, he subdued the understanding of mankind, his own deeper penetration taught him, from what quarter the storm must really issue, which would finally overthrow his throne: and in the lineaments of that little cloud, which raised its prophetic hand in the horizon of heresy, he read the denunciation of future wrath, and heard the distant murmur of advancing reason.

III. It was not till the Popes had established their authority in most of the Courts of Europe, that the principles of persecution were displayed in their full extent, or the practice attended with much barbarity. The previous efforts of Alexander III. and Calixtus II. betrayed the disposition and showed the sting—but it was not yet armed and poisoned. The execution of the mystics of Orleans, at a still earlier period, was perpetrated by the king and the bishop, without any excuse of pontifical interference. In fact, the unity of the Church was not protected by the authorized use of the sword, until the reign of Innocent III. His great power enabled him not only to turn a casual storm against a particular sect of the heretics of the day; but to engage the temporal weapon, by a general and perpetual edict, in the service of the spiritual.

On the treatment of Heretics by the Church.

The third Canon of the Lateran council, held by that Pontiff, contained an injunction to the effect, 'that temporal lords be admonished, and, if necessary, compelled by censures, to take a public oath to exterminate heretics from their territories. If any one, being thus required, shall refuse to purge his land, he shall be excommunicated by the Metropolitan and his suffragans; and if he shall give proofs of still further contumacy, the Pope shall absolve his subjects from their fealty*...' Of Roman Catholic writers, those who would willingly cleanse their Church from the stain of blood, and those who disapprove of its claims to temporal authority, are equally perplexed by this edict. But while there are some who affect to doubt its genuineness; while others affirm, that it was directed only against feudatories, not against the supreme Lord; others, that it was dictated by Innocent to a council so servile, as even to impeach its authority; others again, that it was only levelled against the contemporary here-

* The words are these:—'Si vero Dominus Temporalis requisitus et monitus ab ecclesia terram suam purgare neglexerit ab hac heretica fœditate, per metropolitanos et ceteros episcopos comprovinciales excommunicationis vinculo innodetur. Et si satisfacere contempserit infra annum, significetur hoc summo pontifici: et extunc ipse vassallos ab ejus fidelitate denuntiet absolutos, et terram exponet catholicis occupendam... salvo jure domini principalis, dummodo super hoc ipse nullum præstet obstaculum, nec aliquod impedimentum opponat: eadem nihilominus lege servata circa eos, qui non habent dominos principales.' See Labb. Concil. Collect. tom. xxii. p. 981, et seq., et supra chap. xviii. p. 349.

tics, whose detested Manicheism deserved the sentence—a more plausible excuse may be alleged in the consent or silence of the princes and ambassadors, who were present at the council. In fact, on Innocent's death, which followed soon afterwards, Honorius, his successor, applied to Frederic II. to insert the Canon among the constitutions of the empire. He did so. And having thus embarked the State in the same conspiracy with the Church, and degraded it, besides, to be the mere executioner of the sentences of its accomplice, he loaded the former with ignominy, and shared without in any respect diminishing the guilt of the latter.

Henceforward, the ecclesiastical and civil authorities legally and systematically co-operated in the destruction of many bold and virtuous spirits, who for three successive centuries asserted, under different forms and names, the private right of reading and interpreting the Gospel. Henceforward, the secular arm was ever in subservient attendance on the decisions of sacerdotal barbarity; and it was in this subordinate ministry of an independent power, that the real executioners found a pretext to proclaim their own unsullied charity—that *their* hands, at least, were undefiled; that the Church was merciful and long-suffering, and that the penal flames were lighted by the vengeance of the temporal powers!

The Inquisition embodied the principles and practice of persecution; and, notwithstanding the abhorrence which it raised in some places, it was an engine of good service in protecting the Unity of the Roman Catholic Church. That fatal principle, of which the name, at least, and even the seeds may be traced to the earliest ages, occasioned more than half the crimes that stain the ecclesiastical annals. Every hope of salvation was confined to the bosom of the Church; should any dare to abandon that exclusive sanctuary, their heritage was eternal perdition—if, then, by the fear or endurance of mere temporary torture men could be preserved from eternal inflictions, was not the office salutary? was not the duty peremptory? Alas! for the presumption of those who were sincere in this profession. But, if any there were who falsely joined the cry, with no further object, than to support the system by which they profited, there may be pardon reserved for them in the mercy of God, but there is no term in the vocabulary of crime which can express their guilt.

It would be an insult on human nature not to suppose, that among the ministers of the Roman Church there were many, who individually abhorred the practice, and softened by their private tolerance the rigour of the ecclesiastical code. But the high and dominant party in the Church was always that, which stretched the principle of its 'Unity' to its extreme length, and pursued the victims of that principle with as much severity, as the policy of princes and the endurance of the laity would permit. As in the thirteenth century, so was it in the fifteenth; as in the Lateran, so was it in the halls of Constance; as with Innocent, so with Gerson and Clemangis, and the reformers of Innocent's abuses*. The

* It must not be understood that Innocent III. deliberately corrupted, or even relaxed, the ecclesiastical discipline—on the contrary, he published many excellent decrees for its severer observance—only, by unduly aggrandizing papal authority he rendered those decrees in effect nugatory. Thus, for instance, respecting the abuses of pluralities and non-residence—the fourteenth canon of the *Third Lateran Council* (held by Alexander III.) denounced both those practices in very strong terms, as in direct violation of the ancient canons—and added: 'Cum igitur ecclesia, vel ecclesiasticum ministerium committi debuerit, talis ad hoc persona queratur, quæ residere in loco, et curam ejus per seipsum valeat exercere'—on the penalty of deprivation to the minister, and loss of patronage to the patron. Innocent III., thirty-six years afterwards, published a canon (the twenty-

spirit *possessed* the Church: thence it emanated and swelled the bosoms of its ministers; and the more devoted was the individual to the service of that Church, the more thoroughly was his soul impregnated with the venom.

It was not, that even these Ecclesiastics were necessarily destitute of private virtues, or that they lost, in the exercise of official barbarity, all sense of justice and all feeling of mercy. They might be compassionate, they might even be charitable. It might be, that they were only cruel and unjust, and uncharitable, in as far as they were imbued with the high ecclesiastical principle—in as far as they identified the religion of the Gospel with their own modification of it—in as far as they mistook the interests of their order for the honour of Christ.

A practice sanctified by the authority, and enforced by the zeal of the sacred body, found innumerable advocates among the laity, and it was never in more general favour, than at the end of the fifteenth century. Even the philosophers of that age were hostile to the exercise, or perhaps ignorant of the name, of tolerance. The Popes pressed with unrelenting rigour the hereditary usage; and the arm of the Inquisition was lengthened, and its ingenuity sharpened and refined. In the rarity of Christian* victims—for the Hussites were not victims, but enemies and warriors—attention was turned to the perversity of the Jews; and Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII. and Alexander VI. added to their other offences the crime of persecution. Persecution was, indeed, at this time almost the only proof which the Court of Rome affected to exhibit of its attachment to religion. It was become the apparent object of the spiritual government; and the perpetrator of every enormity sought atonement for his guilt in the blood of the misbeliever. It was become a part of ecclesiastical morality; and it was now founded not so much on hostility to any particular opinion, or any bigoted belief in the opposite, as on the determination, that no new opinion should be broached with impunity. It was not against the results of thought, but against the liberty of thinking, that the bolts were now really levelled. The rebellion was more detestable than the heresy; and the wretches, who dared to plead their Bible against their Church, were marked out, not for conversion, but for massacre†.

ninth) in the *Fourth* Lateran, on the same subject. Herein, he referred to the law of Alexander, mentioned the little fruit which it had produced, and decreed in confirmation of it, 'ut quicumque receperit aliquod beneficium habens curam animarum annexam, si prius tale beneficium obtinebat, eo sit jure ipso privatus: et si forte illud retinere contenderit, alio etiam spoliatur.' He added, moreover, that no one should hold two dignities in the same church, even without cure of souls. But then he concluded with a *salvo*, which Alexander had not interposed, in favour of the Pope's dispensing power; 'Circa sublimes tamen et literatas personas, quæ majoribus sunt beneficiis honorandæ, cum ratio postulaverit, per sedem apostolicam poterit dispensari.'

* It should not, however, be forgotten that the Vaudois suffered several severe outrages during this period. In 1400 they were attacked in the Valley of Pragela and driven to the summits of the mountains, where many died from starvation. In 1460 the Separatists in the Val Fressinière (on the French side) were persecuted by a Franciscan, under the authority of the Archbishop of Ambrun. Every thing that fraud and calumny could invent seems on that occasion to have been practised against them. In 1487 and 1488 fresh bulls were issued, followed by military violence. Albert de Capitaneis, Archdeacon of Cremona, was deputed by Innocent VIII. to command the attack. But the fortune of war appears for this time to have favoured the oppressed. See Milner, Cent. xiii. chap. iii.

† 'On ne voulait point convertir les Bohémiens (says Sismondi), on voulait les traîner sur le bûcher.' We may plead the authority of that historian for the justice of some of these last remarks. See likewise Semler, *Secl. xv. cap. iii. p. 51, &c. &c.* Still it should be observed, that a certain latitude of private judgment, on certain subjects, was

The end, being holy, sanctified the means; and in pursuing the details of religious warfare, we shall commonly observe, that, if the deeds of pure atrocity are equally balanced, the superiority in fraud, perfidy and perjury, is without any comparison on the side of the Catholics.

IV. It is needless here to repeat the names of the anti-papal adherents of Louis the Bavarian, or of the more eminent reformers of Constance and Basle. Nor shall we recur to the premature, but not fruitless, efforts of Wiclif and Huss. But it is proper to make some mention of those individuals who were distinguished for their opposition to ecclesiastical abuses during the latter part of the fifteenth century. These were the immediate precursors of Luther; and though differing on many matters from each other and from him; and though his inferiors in evangelical wisdom, in intellectual power and personal character, they were not without their use in preparing the path for his triumph. In 1479, John of Wesalia incurred, by some opinions unfavourable to the pretensions of the hierarchy, the indignation of the Monastic Orders. He pronounced indulgences to be of no avail—

Some individual Reformers of the Fifteenth Century. that the Pope, bishops and priests were not instruments for the obtaining of salvation. He spoke with disparagement of the fasts, of the holy oil, of pilgrimages, of the Pope and his Councils. He advocated the Greek doctrine on the procession of the Holy Ghost. Moreover, he was a zealous Nominalist, at a moment when the violence of the rival scholastics equalled any recorded display of theological rancour. He was brought to trial; among his judges Monks and Realists preponderated; 'if Christ (said he) were now present, and ye were to treat him as ye treat me, He might be condemned by you as a heretic.' He was pronounced guilty; and, in spite of a tardy retraction, was committed to penitential confinement in a monastery, where he presently died.

John Wesselus, of Gröningen, was more eminent in genius and learning, and more fortunate in the circumstances of his fate; since he enjoyed the friendship of Sixtus IV., and died in peace (in 1489) in his native city. His general attainments were such as to acquire for him the title of the 'Light of the World;' and among the numerous witnesses of the truth*, it is he who has been more peculiarly designated the Forerunner of

generally indulged to the members of the Church, as, for instance, to many Mystics; but this was either when the 'Latitudinarians' were in themselves deemed innocent, or when the opinions touched none of the essentials of the ecclesiastical system, none of the sources of dignity, revenue, &c. Thus, for example, in the dispute between Luther and Cardinal Carvajal, there were two grand subjects of difference, indulgences and justification. Luther was disposed to attach by far the highest importance to the latter; but the Cardinal assured him, that if he would retract his error respecting indulgences, the other affair could be easily arranged.

* The 'Catalogus Testium Veritatis,' by Flacius, is intended, we presume, to contain every name and thing which has in any age and by any means done any ill to Papacy. Out of the various particulars of this Catalogue (which begins with *Sacra Scriptura* and ends with *Concilia XV. Seculi*), we select as specimens the following names:—Constantine, Gregory the Great, Bede, Charlemagne, Claudius of Turin, Hincmar, Paschasius Radbertus, Otho Frisingensis, Nicholaus Orem, Scotus, Occam, Dante, Petrarch, Wiclif, Gerson, Ziska, Peter of Luna, Aeneas Sylvius, Platina, Trithemius, Wessalia, Wesselus, Savonarola, Machiavel, and above all *Germania vulgus*. Reasons are alleged under each of these names for its insertion in the honourable list.

Luther. The resemblance between them was, indeed, remarkable, not only as to the conclusions at which they arrived, but as to the steps by which they reached them. Insomuch, that Luther himself, in a preface, in which he recommended to more general attention some of the works of Wesselus, used the following expressions:—‘It is very plain that he was taught of God, as Isaiah prophesied that Christians should be; and as in my case, so with him, it cannot be supposed that he received his doctrines from men. If I had read his works before, my enemies might have supposed that I had learnt every thing from Wesselus, such a perfect coincidence there is in our opinions. As to myself, I not only derive pleasure, but strength and courage from this publication. It is now impossible for me to doubt, whether I am right in the points which I have inculcated, when I see so entire an agreement in sentiment, and almost the same words used by this eminent person, who lived in a different age, in a distant country, and in circumstances very unlike my own. I am surprised that this excellent Christian writer should be so little known—the reason may be that he lived without blood and contention, for this is the only thing in which he differed from me....’ This was written in 1522, when Luther had made some progress towards evangelical perfection. His testimony makes it unnecessary to particularize the opinions of Wesselus; but we may relate one anecdote respecting him, which proves that the humble, unambitious spirit of the Gospel had penetrated to his heart, and influenced his conduct under powerful temptation.

When Sixtus IV. was raised to the chair, not forgetful of his antient friendship with Wesselus, he offered to grant him any request. Wesselus replied by a solemn exhortation to the Pontiff, faithfully to discharge his weighty duties. ‘That (replied Sixtus) shall be my care: but do you ask something for yourself.’—‘Then (rejoined Wesselus), I beg you to give me out of the Vatican library, a Greek and a Hebrew bible.’—‘You shall have them (said Sixtus); but, is not this folly? Why do you not ask for some Bishopric, or something of that sort?’—‘Because I want not such things.’—It is recorded, that the Hebrew Bible, which was given in consequence of this dialogue, was long preserved in the library at Gröningen*.

John Laillier, licentiate in theology, advanced, at Paris, in July, 1485, various offensive positions, derogating from the power and primacy of St. Peter; asserting an equality of ranks *John Laillier*, in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the uselessness of even pontifical indulgences, and the human institution of confession. He argued, that the decrees and decretals were mere mockeries, that the Roman Church was not the key of the other churches, with other matters of a like nature, and he defended his opinions in public disputation against the doctors of the Sorbonne. We find nine of his propositions expressly specified, together with the censure affixed to each of them, and we shall here insert two or three of the most curious:—*Pro-*

* ‘Hæc nobis erunt curæ; tu pro te aliquod pete. Rogo, ergo, inquit Wesselus, ut mihi detis ex Bibliotheca Vaticana Græca et Hebræa Biblia. Ea, inquit Sextus, tibi dabuntur—Sed tu stultè; quare non petis episcopatum aliquem, aut simile quidpiam? Respondit Wesselus, quia iis non indigeo.’ See *Vita Wesseli inter Vitæ Professorum Groningens.* The story is there related as one, that was frequently told by Wesselus himself. Some valuable abstracts from the writings of this reformer are given by Milner, *History of the Church*, end of cent. xv. and Semler, cent. xv. cap. iv. p. 212—219. Bayle calls him ‘un des plus habiles hommes du quinziesme siècle.’

position (III.) 'Rich saints are now canonized and poor saints abandoned ; wherefore I am not obliged to believe that such are saints. If the Pope receives money, though he should mount on twenty scaffolds to canonize a saint, I am not bound to believe him such ; nor is he, who disbelieves, in sin.' *Censure*. 'This proposition is false, offensive to pious ears, injurious to the holy apostolical See, contrary to the piety of the faithful, — and the third part of it, according to the sense which it presents, is heretical.' *Proposition* (V.) 'The priests of the Eastern Church do no sin in marrying ; and I think that we, in the Western Church, should be equally free from sin, if we were to marry.' *Censure*. 'The first part of the proposition in the sense which it presents, viz. that the Eastern priests marry after taking orders, is false. The second, which is the profession of the author's faith, makes him guilty of error ; if he adds obstinacy, of heresy.' *Proposition* (IX.) 'One is no more obliged to believe the legends of the saints, than the chronicles of the kings of France.' *Censure*. 'This proposition is false, and capable of offending pious ears ; it derogates from the authority of the Church, and, if taken universally, is even heretical.'

Sentence of condemnation was passed in the following year, and the offender was commanded to retract. He did so with perfect humility. The Bishop of Paris immediately granted him full and unconditional absolution. But the faculty, less placable, prohibited him from proceeding to his doctor's degree, and appealed from the bishop's decision to the Pope. Innocent VIII. seems even to have surpassed the hopes of his petitioners ; for he issued an order that Laillier should be thrown into prison. But whether the sentence was executed, or whether the protection of the bishop availed to preserve him from it, does not appear from the records of this transaction*. They are sufficient, however, to show us, that the theological faculty of Paris, notwithstanding the boasted *Liberties* of the Church, was very little disposed to encourage, or even to endure any evangelical truth, which might endanger the spiritual despotism of Rome. Nor is this wonderful ; since Paris was the very centre and nursery of the scholastic system.

Such were the principal Cisalpine † 'witnesses' of that age ; and their obscurity may be ascribed to their own timidity or to the overwhelming power of the hierarchy. But Italy, at the same time, produced a far more celebrated champion of reform ; such a man, so enthusiastic in his piety, so wild in his enthusiasm, so daring in his spiritual pretensions, — as might have been expected to rise up in that country, where the vices of the Church were best known ; and among that people, which has seldom tempered religious zeal with any discretion ; which loves to be addressed through the imagination rather than the reason, and whose emotions, if strong, are always violent and generally transient. Jerome Savonarola was born at Ferrara in 1452, the descendant of an illustrious family. His early years gave indications of a profound religious feeling, and he presently assumed the habit of a Dominican. In 1483 he first felt those impulses, which gave the peculiar character to his mission ; he began to

* This account is taken from the continuator of Fleury (liv. cxvi. s. 30—38) who refers to *D'Argentré Collectio. Judic.*, tom. i. p. 308. ann. 1484.

† Lest Spain should seem to have had no candidate for admission into this venerable host, we should mention that one Peter of Osma, professor of theology at Salamanca, published some anti-papal and anti-ecclesiastical opinions in the year 1479. It is remarkable, that the Pope, in condemning, refused to specify them, on account of their enormity — 'to the end, that those, who already know them, may the sooner forget them ; and that those, who know them not, may learn no new sin.' See the continuator of Fleury, lib. cxv. s. 2, 3. &c.

preach on prophecy, and himself assumed the mission of a prophet. His first effusions were delivered at Brescia; but in 1489 he desired a more extensive field for his powers, and proceeded to Florence.

Most of the Italian cities were distracted by political factions, and none, perhaps, so fiercely as Florence. These agitations reached down to the lowest classes, and in the bosom of the meanest citizen there was a nerve exquisitely sensible to all appeals, respecting his public rights. Thus, whether in the design to enlarge the range of his influence, or because he really shared the popular passion, Savonarola combined the politician's with the prophet's character*, and made each, as the circumstances of the moment required, subservient to the other. Reform was the subject on which he preached, reform and penitence—reform in the discipline of the Church, in the disorders of the clergy, in the morals of the people—reform instant and immediate, ere the tempest of divine vengeance, which was already impending over Italy, should descend and overwhelm it. He made no appeals to reason, none to the ordinary principles, or even passions of men—it was in the name of heaven, that he commanded them to amend; it was inspiration from above—the unerring prescience of imminent calamities—which filled him with eloquence, and armed his eloquence with authority and terror. It was no dew of persuasion that fell from his lips—it was the word of an offended God, clothed in thunder and hail, announcing the approach of desolation.

At the same time he promised the divine protection to the republican party. He denounced the usurpation of Lorenzo de' Medici, and refused to acknowledge his power, or show deference to his person. He pursued with fierce anathemas the luxury and despotism of the aristocracy; and his genius was so extraordinary and his enthusiasm so resistless, as almost to give a colour to his claims of supernatural communications. At least we need not discredit the accounts we read of his controlling influence over the people, and of the various acts by which their devotion was displayed. Multitudes believed in his heavenly mission†; and the effect of his moral exhortations was speedily perceptible throughout the city. 'By the modesty of their dress, their discourse, their countenance, the Florentines gave evidence, that they had embraced the reform of Savonarola; and it was easy to foresee (says Sismondi) that the political lessons of the preacher would not produce less impression on his audience, than his moral instructions.'

The political impression was more violent, and proportionally less beneficial. Savonarola had promised the citizens of Florence—or they understood him to have promised—that a pure theocracy should be substituted for their actual government, and that Christ himself should deign to rule over them. On this, the popular fury rose beyond all restraint. It was in vain, that the Pope thundered from the Vatican. It was in vain, that the clergy refused to bury the bodies of any, who believed the announce-

* 'Il vouloit (as a French writer observes) jouer à la fois le rôle de Jérémie et de Démotènes.' We may recollect that Arnold of Brescia, who, like Savonarola, was an Italian, a reformer, and a martyr, like him also denounced, in the same breath, political and ecclesiastical abuses. And we should remind the reader, that Sismondi compares the sort of mixed influence, acquired by Savonarola over the people of Florence, to that exercised by Calvin at Geneva.

† It seems probable that the enthusiasm for this man—we may even call it, the belief in him—was not confined to the lowest classes. The story of his interview with Benivieni, (told by Nardi, Stor. Fiorent. lib. ii., and cited by Roscoe,) proves, at least, his authority over these in command. Nardi likewise mentions the hesitation, and even apprehension, with which the inquisitors themselves made the first application of the torture.

ment of the prophet. The people thronged to listen to his sermons; and not unfrequently, when the harangue was concluded, rushed forth from the churches and assembled in the squares and public places, with tumultuous cries of *Viva Christo!* They would then dance in circles, formed by a citizen and a friar placed alternately, and commit every kind of absurdity*.

In 1494, Savonarola conducted the Florentine embassy to Charles VIII.

*His interview
with Charles
VIII.*

at Lucca. It was in Charles that his prophecies (as he confidently declared) were accomplished—Charles was the promised minister of vengeance, commissioned to chastise the crimes of Italy. The monk presented himself before the victorious monarch, as the ambassador of a suppliant city—but he did not lose in the character of the monk or of the envoy the consciousness of his heavenly mission: he did not forget, that the man whom he addressed was the mere instrument sent to fulfil *his* predictions, and accomplish the work of Providence. Himself was the prophet of the Lord—he maintained the superiority, communicated by a nearer intercourse with God, and preserved his customary tone of admonition and command†.

In the mean time, the enemies of Savonarola, if less numerous and enthusiastic, were more constant and determined than his friends. The aristocracy of Florence, supported by the Pope and all the superior clergy, were patiently watching for the moment to destroy him. A ready weapon was furnished by monastic dissension: the Franciscans, already jealous of the fame of a rival, were eager to enter the lists against him. At the proper season they commenced their attack—and the object, of course, was to withdraw from their adversary the only foundation of his strength, the confidence of the people.

It was not by assailing him from the pulpit, that this could be effected; his great powers and irresistible authority forbade any hope of overthrowing him in a field which was peculiarly his own. Accordingly, the Franciscans proceeded by a very different method; against the popular impostor they made their appeal to the grossest popular superstition. A Franciscan challenged Savonarola to go through his trial by fire, together with himself. The prophet reserved his own person for greater occasions; but a faithful Dominican undertook the ordeal in his place: and had he not thus anticipated the general devotion, a multitude of citizens, of women, and even of priests, would have pressed to the flames with eagerness, as the substitutes of Savonarola. The government gave its sanction;

* Roscoe (whom we have consulted with profit on the subject of Savonarola) cites from Girolamo Beniveni, who composed songs for these occasions, the following specimen (it can scarcely be a fair specimen) of the popular effusions:—

‘Non fù mai più bel solazzo
Più grande, nè maggiore,
Che per zelo è per amore
Di JESU—diventar pazzo—
Ognun gridi, com’ io grido,
Semprè pazzo, pazzo, pazzo.’

† ‘Come, come with confidence, come with joy and triumph; for the Being who sends thee is even he, who, for our salvation, triumphed on the cross. Nevertheless, listen to my words, most Christian king, and engrave them in thy heart. The servant of God, to whom these things have been revealed by divine communication, warns even thee, who art sent by the Majesty of heaven, that, after his example, it is thy duty to show mercy every where,’ &c. Such were the opening sentences of the prophet’s harangue. Sismondi (who displays even more than his usual eloquence in his account of this enthusiast) has translated the whole address, chap. xciii.

the day (April 17, 1498) was fixed for the trial; the necessary preparations were made; and the entire population of Florence and the neighbouring towns and villages thronged to the spot, in devout expectation of some visible sign of the divine interposition. The two parties presented themselves; the flames were kindled—but even then, in the presence of the chiefs of the Republic and the impatient multitudes, a dispute arose, which finally prevented the exhibition. The people dispersed, disappointed and irritated. It also happened, that the subject of the dispute had been such, as to raise a prejudice against Savonarola. The Dominican, his substitute, had, in the first instance, required to enter the flames in his sacerdotal habits, to which the Franciscans reasonably objected. The former then expressed his readiness to enter naked, on the condition only that he should carry the host in his hand. The Franciscans again refused their consent; and, as Savonarola persisted in that condition, the ordeal did not take place. Now, besides the appearance of some secret design in his perseverance in this last demand, the people were easily taught to believe that it contained no slight mixture of impiety. To commit the body of Christ, under any human guarantee for its security, to the raging flames, was, to treat with irreverence, to profane, nay perhaps to expose to destruction, the most holy of all things. Savonarola was not, indeed, without his advocates; but it was clear, that the popular current had turned. The advantage was instantly pursued; the prophet was seized, imprisoned, tortured; and immediately on the arrival of two legates from Alexander VI. he was condemned to death, and executed. His ashes, according to the usual precaution, were cast into the Arno—and it does not appear, that his exertions, either religious or political, extraordinary as they certainly were, and for the time successful too, impressed any lasting trace of any description even on the history of that city, to which they were exclusively confined.

Execution.

John Reuchlin (or Capnio, as he was called), a German of great reputation and integrity, lent his indirect assistance to the cause of religion by his labours for the restoration of learning*. He died in 1522, and received his apotheosis from the pen of Erasmus, who had entered on the same career with still higher powers and greater celebrity. Of Erasmus much need not here be said, since his merits and weaknesses are generally known and not improperly estimated. His writings rendered the highest service to the first reformers—he had already stigmatized numerous abuses; he had rejected the Scholastic divinity, and recommended and facilitated the study of the Bible and the Fathers; he had covered with ridicule and contempt the vices of the monks, and their love for the ignorance in which they grovelled. By such means as these he had contributed to the success of the Reformation, even more perhaps than he had himself designed; for his predominant passion was that for literature; and though by no means indifferent to the interests of religion, he was fearful of all great practical changes, and could never shake off that irresolute timidity so commonly associated with literary habits.

Reuchlin and Erasmus.

* It was Reuchlin (in the representation) who threw down the straight and crooked billets, which Erasmus tried in vain to accommodate: then came Luther, and set fire to the crooked ones, &c. Reuchlin was honoured by the hatred of the monks, who would willingly have fixed upon him the imputation of heresy.

V. If the oppression of Rome was now generally felt and acknowledged throughout Europe; if the scandals of the court were now becoming every where notorious, and the vices of the monks and clergy had inflamed the general hatred of Christendom; there was no country in which either the tyranny or the licentiousness of the Church was so shamelessly exhibited and so deeply detested as in Germany. While the first Othos imitated the policy of Charlemagne in exalting the sacred order*, they even exceeded his generosity; and some of the leading German ecclesiastics became at the same time bishops and powerful princes. Nor was there any region more pregnant with popular superstition, and with the fruits so diligently gathered from it by a worldly priesthood. From these causes the wealth of the German Clergy had grown to an inordinate excess; and their secular habits and vulgar vices† are stigmatized in every age of history. The proceedings of the Council of Vienne — the remonstrance of the Emperor Charles IV. to the archbishop of Mayence, and, above all, the *prophetic* denunciations of Cardinal Julian, at the Council of Basle, display at the same time the immorality and the insecurity of the German Church.

From the time of Gregory VII. the political interests of the empire and the Popedom had been at perpetual variance. And not only was Italy divided between their conflicting parties, but even the internal concord of Germany had been incessantly disturbed by pontifical interference. Its emperors had been insulted and deposed; Italian intrigues had distracted all its provinces; children had been raised up against their parents; and the battles and miseries of four centuries had been inseparably associated with the name and enmity of Rome. It was the consequence of this inveterate hostility, not only to nourish public animosity, but also to raise up private opponents against the See, who had at various times uncloaked its abuses and denounced them to the people. So that, when the appointed season at length arrived, the prejudices of the lower classes had been in a great degree removed; and they listened without repugnance, and frequently with intense satisfaction, to any thing that reflected upon the See or Court of Rome.

The Germans had endeavoured to protect their Church against the pontifical depredators by the Concordats of Constance and *Concordats* Aschaffenburg; and however narrow the field of amend-
violated. ment which they comprehended, still, had they been strictly observed, some advantage would have been produced, and some irritation allayed. But so far were the Popes from any desire to correct usurpation by timely concession, or sincerely to conciliate those whom they had injured, and whom they ought to have feared, that they made it their policy to elude the conditions which they had reluctantly accorded, and to resume in substance the spoils which they had in semblance restored. By this conduct they not only nourished without any remission the prevalent animosity against them, but they

* Their motive too was the same, to counterpoise the power of the barons; and it is a deed, for which they are almost invariably praised by ecclesiastical, and condemned by civil, historians.

† The Bavarian ambassador, addressing the Council of Trent in 1562, asserted, respecting the morality of his clerical fellow-subjects, that there were not more than three or four in a hundred who were not either secretly or openly married, or living in a state of concubinage (P. Paolo, Hist. Conc. Trident. lib. vi.) The saying of Pius II. on this subject, that if there were good reasons, for enacting the law of celibacy, there were better for repealing it, was now in every man's mouth.

inflamed it still further, when they aggravated former oppressions by recent perfidy. There was, indeed, no part of Christendom, wherein the whole machinery of the apostolical chancery* had worked with such pernicious efficacy as in Germany. The privileges of the Jubilee, so fruitful to the See which granted, so expensive to the districts which enjoyed them, were dispensed during the schism principally to that country; the fathers of Constance and Basle published, though they failed to remove, its complaints and the circumstances of its oppression; and the 'Hundred Grievances'† which were afterwards presented to the Diet of Nuremberg (in 1523) formed only a catalogue of hereditary wrongs, the subjects of perpetual remonstrance, and of remonstrance which was perpetually despised.

The papal usurpations enumerated in that celebrated document are severally placed under three heads—such as tended to enthral the people; such as impoverished and despoiled them; such as withdrew them from the secular jurisdiction. Thus the interests of the people were become *The People of Germany.* the foundation of the remonstrances of their rulers; thus, too, was it in *their* affections that the Reformer had fixed his surest asylum‡. At a somewhat earlier moment (on April 1, 1520), Frederic, Elector of Saxony, addressed to his Envoy at Rome the following remarkable expressions:— 'Germany is no longer such as it has been; it is full of accomplished men in all the sciences. The people exhibit an extraordinary passion for reading the Scriptures§; and if the Court of Rome shall obstinately persist in rejecting the offers of Luther and in treating the affair with haughtiness, instead of replying to his arguments, she must prepare herself for troubles which will hardly be appeased, and for revolutions which will be no less fatal to herself than to others.' To this wise admonition Leo X. addressed a reply, in which he designated Luther 'as the most wicked and detestable of all heretics—a man who had no other mission than that which he had received from the Devil!'

The condition of Germany being such as the Elector represented it, and the disposition of the Vatican such as is betrayed in the answer of the Pope, it is not difficult to comprehend the nature or the result of the conflict which followed. On the one side, we are led to expect a succes-

* About the time of the Diet of Augsburg (in 1518) an archbishop of Mayence declared, during his last moments, that his greatest regret in dying was to leave to his poor subjects the burden of buying the *pallium* of his successor. About 27,000 florins appear to have been advanced on these occasions, and it was chiefly levied upon the poor. Robertson asserts (Hist. Charles V.) that companies of merchants openly bought the benefices of different districts from the Pope's agents, and retailed them at advanced prices.

† The *Centum Gravamina* comprehended the following abuses:—Payments for dispensations and absolutions; sums of money drawn by indulgences; appeals to Rome; reservations, commendams, annates; exemptions of ecclesiastics from the legal punishments; excommunications and unlawful interdicts; secular causes tried before ecclesiastical tribunals; great expenses in consecrating churches and cemeteries; pecuniary penance; fees for sacraments, burials, &c. P. Paolo, Hist. Concil. Trident. lib. i. n. 65.

‡ On Aug. 23, 1520, Luther wrote to Spalatin, 'that he dreaded neither censures nor violence; that he had a safe asylum in the hearts of the Germans, and that his enemies should beware, lest, in destroying one adversary, they should give birth to many.' Beausobre, Hist. de la Réformation, liv. ii.

§ 'The world (said Erasmus in 1521, in his Advice to the Emperor) is weary of the ancient theology, which is only a mass of useless questions and vain subtleties, in which the sophists exercise their ingenuity. The people are thirsting for the doctrine of the Gospel, and if it shall be attempted to close the source against them, they will open it for themselves by force.' This letter is translated by Beausobre. Hist. Réf. liv. iv.

sion of just demands commencing in moderation, and rising in exact proportion to the contempt with which they were rejected—on the other, a fierce and selfish determination to maintain the established system in its full integrity, without distinction of good or evil, of use or abuse, of truth or falsehood, of divine or human authority. And the conclusion was such as must certainly follow, sooner or later, from collision between such principles.

When the train is thus prepared, the moment of explosion will commonly depend on what is called accident; and thus

Conclusion. it will frequently arrive when it is least expected. Thus was it in the beginning of the Reformation. Never

was the Court of Rome more confident in the sense of security, than at that instant. The various heresies which had so long disturbed the Church were, for the most part, dismayed and silenced; the complaints and petitions of the faithful had long been rejected with insolent impunity; the Council which had last been held had effaced by its subservience the memory of Basle and Constance; and the warnings of Julian Cesarini were despised or forgotten. The temporal monarchy of Rome was more firmly established than at any former period, and her power and influence were still considerable in every part of Europe—her ecclesiastical agents were never more numerous or more zealous in her service. The pillars of her strength were visible and palpable, and she surveyed them with exultation from her golden palaces; but she did not so readily discern the moral causes which were combining for her dissolution, and slowly and secretly sapping the foundations of her pride.

The qualities of Leo X., though not despicable, were not calculated for that crisis—fond of letters, devoted to pleasure, contemptuous of morality—ignorant of the science, careless of the duties, neglectful even of the decencies, of religion; vain, extravagant, uccessitous and venal, he had not the character which could prevent the rebellion, or crush the rebel. Tempered in the schools of courtly negotiation, the weapons of the Vatican were of no service against a popular enemy; and the Pope himself at length condescended to complain*, that ‘the present disease was not in the princes and great prelates, with whom familiarity and interest prevailed, but in the people, with whom it was necessary to use reality, and make a true reformation.’ In that people, so long the object of pontifical contempt and spoliation, new energies had insensibly replaced the incurious and servile ignorance of former days. An occasion and an instrument were alone required to bring them into action. The former was furnished by the vices and blindness of the Church; the latter was raised up by Providence in the person of Luther. Yet Luther himself, endowed as he was with great and ardent qualities, was but the voice that called the labourers to their office. The abuses were so ripe and pregnant, and the perception of them so deep and so general, that, even had Luther never been born, the harvest could not long have needed bold and holy ministers to gather it. ‘I do not doubt, (they are the words of the Reformer himself addressed to Melancthon,) that if we are unworthy to bring this work to its conclusion, God will raise up others, worthier than we are, who will accomplish it.’

* Padre Paolo, Hist. Concil. Trident. liv. i.

A CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF

EMINENT MEN, AND OF THE PRINCIPAL COUNCILS.

Popes.	Died.	Eminent Persons connect- ed with Ecclesiastical History.	Important Councils.
LINUS . . .	78		
Anaclethus . . .	91		
Clement . . .	100		
Alexander . . .	116	Pliny the Younger. Ig- nati- natus. Tacitus.	
Sixtus . . .	126		
Telesphorus . . .	137		
Hyginus . . .	141	Justin Martyr.	
Pius . . .	157	Polycarp.	
Anicetus . . .	168	Montanus.	
Soter . . .	177	Pantænus.	
Eleutherus * . . .	192	Irenæus.	
Victor . . .	196	Ammonias Saccas.	
		Clemens Alexandrinus.	
Zephyrinus . . .	219	Tertullian.	
Callistus . . .	224	Origen. Celsus.	
Urban . . .	231		
Pontianus . . .	235		
Anterus . . .	236		
Fabianus . . .	251	Sabellius.	A Synod at Rome against Novatian (251).
Cornelius . . .	253	Cyprian.	
A Schism between Cornelius and No- vatian.			
Lucius . . .	255		Synod at Carthage (256), by Cyprian, on the Baptism of Heretics.
Stephen . . .	257		
Sixtus II. . . .	259	Paul of Samosata.	Synod at Antioch (269), against Paul of Samosata.
Dionysius . . .	271	Manes.	
Felix . . .	275	Porphyry.	
Eutychianus . . .	283		
Caius . . .	296		
Marcellinus . . .	304		
Marcellus . . .	309	Lactantius.	
Eusebius . . .	311		
Melchiades . . .	†314	Constantine. Eusebius of Cæsarea. Arius. Eusebius of Nico- media. Athanasius.	Arles (314), against the Donatists.
Sylvester . . .	335		I. (<i>General</i> .) The Council of Nice (325).

* The succession of the earliest Bishops of Rome and the duration of their government are involved in inexplicable confusion. We have followed Spanheim.

† The *Indiction* was a cycle of three lustræ, or a revolution of fifteen years. It was instituted by Constantine soon after his victory over Maxentius (September 24, 312), and the financial accounts for the payment of tribute were regulated by this term. At the Council of Nice the method of *Indiction* was substituted for that of *Olympiads*. The year of the first *Indiction* began January 1, 313; consequently, to find this *Indiction*, subtract 312 from the given year, or add three to it; divide the difference, or sum by 15, and the remainder, if any, will be the year of the *Indiction*. The Popes still use this cycle in their bulls and diplomas.

‡ The italics designate the Councils held General by the Latin Church.

Popes.	Died.	Eminent Persons connected with Ecclesiastical History.	Important Councils.
Mark . . .	336	Constantius.	Synod of Tyre (335), against Athanasius.
Julius . . .	352	Martin of Tours.	Council of Seleucia (359), held by the Semi-arians.
Liberius . . .	367	Julian. Ammianus Marcellinus.	Council of Rimini (360).
A Schism between Liber and Felix.		Chrysostom.	Synod of Saragossa (380) against Priscillian.
		Gregory Nazianzenus.	
		Basil. Gregory of Nyssa.	
		Priscillian.	
Damasus . . .	385	Theodosius the Great.	II. <i>First of Constantinople</i> (381), on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.
Schism between Damasus and Ursicinus		Ambrose of Milan.	Council of Milan (390), against Jovinian.
		St. Martin, A. B., of Tours.	Council of Carthage (398), prohibited secular studies.
		Jerome. Jovinian.	Conference at Carthage, against the Donatists (411).
		Vigilantius.	
Siricius . . .	398	Augustin. Donatus.	
		John Cassian, author of the Institutions.	
Anastasius . . .	402	Pelagius and Celestius.	
Innocent . . .	417	Sulpicius Severus.	
Zosimus . . .	418	Socrates.	
Boniface . . .	423	Sozomen.	
Schism between Boniface and Eulalius			
Celestine . . .	432	Nestorius.	III. <i>Council of Ephesus</i> (431), against Nestorius.
			Second (<i>False</i>) Council of Ephesus (449).
Sixtus III. . .	440	Theodoret.	IV. <i>Council of Chalcedon</i> (451), against Eutyches.
		Zosimus.	
Leo the Great . . .	461	Eutyches.	
Hilary . . .	467	Sidonius Apollinaris	
Simplicius . . .	483	(Bishop of Clermont).	
Felix II. . . .	492	Paulinus of Nola.	
Gelasius . . .	496	Clovis.	
Anastasius II. . .	498	Vigilius Tapsensis.	
Schism between Symmachus and Laurentius			
Symmachus . . .	514	Boethius.	Orleans (511), convoked by Clovis, chiefly on Discipline. Others held there, on the same subject, in 538, 541, and 549.
Hormisdas . . .	523		
John	526	Benedict of Nursia.	
Felix III. . . .	530	Justinian.	
Boniface II. . . .	532		
A Schism between Boniface and Dioscorus.			
John II.	535		
Agapetus	536		
Sylvester	540		
Schism between Sylvester and Vigilius.			

Popes.	Died.	Eminent Persons connected with Ecclesiastical History.	Important Councils.
Vigilius . . .	555	St. Gregory, Bishop of Tours.	V. <i>Constantinople</i> , (553) against Origen and others. On the Resurrection of the Flesh and Pre-existence of the Soul. Council of Toledo (589), against the Arians.
Pelagius . . .	559	Isidore of Seville.	
John III. . . .	573	John the Faster, Ph. of C. P.	
Benedict . . .	577		
Pelagius II. . .	590	St. Columban.	
Gregory the Great . .	604	St. Austin, Apostle of England.	
Sabinianus . . .	605		
Boniface III. . . .	606		
Boniface IV. . . .	614		
Deodatus	617	Mahomet.	
Boniface V. . . .	625		
Honorius	638		
Severinus	639	St. Eligius, Bishop of Noyon.	
John IV.	641	Fredegarius of Burgundy.	
Theodore	648		
Martin	655		
Eugenius	656		
Vitalianus	669		
Adrodatus	676		
Domnus	678		
Agatho	682	Heraclius.	
Leo II.	684		VI. <i>Constantinople</i> (680), against the Monothelites. Council of Toledo (682), deposed Vamba, King of the Visigoths.
Benedict II. . . .	685		
John V.	686		
Conon	687		
Sergius	701		Constantinople, in Trullo (692) (Quini-sextum)* on the marriage of the Clergy, &c. The last Council of Toledo (696).
John VI.	704		
John VII.	707		
Sisinnius	707	The Venerable Bede.	
Constantine	714	St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany.	
Gregory II.	731	Leo the Isaurian.	
Gregory III. . . .	741	Charles Martel.	
Zachary	752	Archbishop Cuthbert.	
Stephen II.	752	Pepin, king of France.	
Stephen III. . . .	757	John Damascenus.	Constantinople (754), against Images.
Paul	767	Paul the Lombard.	
Schism between Paul and Theophylact.			

* Neither the fifth nor sixth general council had published any canons respecting ecclesiastical discipline or religious ceremonies. To supply this defect, Justinian II. assembled another in a hall of the Imperial Palace, called *Trullus* (Cupola); and it was called Quini-Sextum, as being supplementary to the fifth and sixth. It passed one hundred and two laws, of which six are in opposition to certain rites and opinions of Rome; on which account the Latins do not hold it general. *Mosh., cent. vii. p. 2, ch. 5.*

Popes.	Died.	Eminent Persons connected with Ecclesiastical History.	Important Councils.
Stephen IV. . .	772	Charlemagne.	VII. <i>Nice</i> (787),
Adrian . . .	795	Alcuin. Eginhardt.	<i>Seventh General</i> , for the restoration Images.
Leo III. . . .	816		Aix la Chapelle (789) for Reformation.
Stephen V. . . .	817	Benedict of Aniane.	Francfort (794), against Image- worship.
Paschal	824	Lewis the Meek.	Others at Aix la Chapelle (in 797, 799, 802, 809, 816, 817, 818, 819).
Eugenius II. . .	827		Five Councils, held in 813, at Arles, Mayence, Rheims, Tours, and Chal- lons.
Valentine . . .	827	Claudius Bishop of Tu- rin.	Paris (824), on Image-worship.
Gregory IV. . .	844	Rabanus Maurus. Ansgarius.	Mayence (848), a- gainst Godeschal- cus,
Sergius II. . . .	847	Paschasius Radbertus. Ratramn. John Scotus. Godeschalcus. Raba- nus Maurus.	
Leo IV.	854	Photius raised to see of C. P.	
*Benedict	858	Charles the Bald. Hincmar of Rheims.	
Schism.		Lupus of Ferrara.	
Nicholas	867	Petrus Siculus.	
Adrian II. . . .	872	Anastasius the Libra- rian.	VIII. (<i>Latin</i>) <i>Con-</i> <i>stantinople</i> (869), for the condem- nation of Photius.
John VIII. . . .	882	John the Deacon.	Constantinople (879) held by Photius, called by the La- tins the False Eighth.
Martin II. . . .	884		
Adrian III. . . .	885	Alfred.	
Stephen VI. . . .	890		
Formosus	897		
Schism.			
Boniface VI. . .	897		
Stephen VII. . .	901		
Schism.			
John IX.	903		
Benedict IV. . .	906		
Leo V.	906		
Schism.			
Christopher . . .	906		

* It is to this place that the fable of the female pope, Joan, seems properly to belong.

Popes.	Died.	Eminent Persons connect- ed with Ecclesiastical History.	Important Councils.
Schism.			
Sergius III. . .	910		
Anastasius III. . .	912		
Lardo . . .	913		
John X. . .	927		
Leo VI. . .	928		
Stephen VIII. . .	930		
John XI. . .	935	St. Odo, Abbot of Clu- ni.	
Leo VII. . .	939		
Stephen IX. . .	943		
Martin III. . .	946		
		Frodoard, Canon of Rheims.	
Agapetus II. . .	955	Otho the Great.	
John XII. . .	963	Bernhard of Thuringia.	
Schism.		Liutprand, Otho's Le- gate at C. P.	
Benedict V. . .	964	St. Dunstan.	
Leo VIII. . .	965		
John XIII. . .	972		
Domnus II. . .	972		
Benedict VI. . .	974		
Boniface VII. . .	975		
Benedict VII. . .	984		
John XIV. . .	985		
John XV. . .	985		
John XVI. . .	995		
Gregory V. . .	998		
Schism.			
Sylvester II. . .	1003		
John XVIII. . .	1003		
John XII. . .	1009		
Sergius IV. . .	1012		
Benedict VIII. . .	1024		
Schism.			
John XX. . .	1033		
Benedict XI. . .	1044		
Schism.			
Gregory VI. . .	1046		
Clement II. . .	1048		
Damasus II. . .	1049		
Leo IX. . .	1054	Michel Cerularius.	
Victor II. . .	1057		
Stephen X. . .	1058		
Benedict X. . .	1059		
Nicholas II. . .	1061		
Schism.			
Alexander II. . .	1073	Petrus Damiani. Lanfranc.	
		Berenger.	
Gregory VII. . .	1086	Henry IV. of Germany.	
Schism.		St. Bruno.	
Victor III. . .	1087	Roscellinus. Anselm.	
		Peter the Hermit.	
Urban II . . .	1099		
			Council at Orleans —some Heretics burnt (1017).
			Council of Nich. II. (1059) regulating Papal election. At Rome, against Berenger.
			Placentia and Cler- mont (1095) ori- ginate first cru- sade.

Popes.	Died.	Eminent Persons connected with Ecclesiastical History.	Important Councils.
Paschal II.	1118		A Lateran Council (1111), which cancelled Paschal's treaty with Henry V.
Gelasius II.	1119	Pierre de Bruis. Peter the Venerable.	At Worms (1122), on question of Investitures. Calixt. II.
Calixtus II.	1124		IX. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>First Lateran Council</i> (1123), on Investitures. Twenty-two canons.
Honorius II.	1130	Abelard. Bernard of Clairval. Henri the Heretic.	Council of Pisa (1134).
Innocent II.	1143		X. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Second Lateran</i> (1139), against Heretics; for the general
Celestine II.	1144		Reformation of the Church. 30 canons are extant.
Lucius II.	1145	Otho Frisingensis.	XI. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Third Lateran</i> (1179), for the arrange-
Eugenius III.	1153	Gratian of Bologna.	ment of Papal Election; against
Anastasius IV.	1154	Peter the Lombard.	Heretics; and for the Reformation
Adrian IV.	1159	Arnold of Brescia.	of the Church*.
Schism.		Frederic Barbarossa.	Council of Paris (1212).
Alexander III.	1181	Thomas à Becket.	XII. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Fourth Lateran</i> (1215), under Innocent III.
Lucius III.	1185	Peter Waldus.	
Urban III.	1187		
Gregory VIII.	1188		
Clement III.	1191	Dominic.	
Celestine III.	1199	Simon de Montfort.	
		Francis d'Assisi.	
Innocent III.	1216		
Honorius III.	1227		
Gregory IX.	1241		
Celestine IV.	1243	John of Parma.	XIII. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>First Council of Lyons</i> (1245), under Innocent IV.
Innocent IV.	1254	Robert Grossetete.	
		Frederic II.	
Alexander IV.	1261	Louis IX. of France.	
Urban IV.	1264	Robert of Sorbonne.	

* The substance of the principal Canons of the *First Lateran* is briefly given at page 310. Of the *Second*, the Ninth Canon prohibited Monks and Canons Regular from practising Civil Law or Medicine; the Thirteenth was directed against usurers; the Fifteenth protected the persons of the Clergy and the right of Asylum. The condemnation of Petrus Leonis and of Arnold of Brescia were separate Acts of Legislation. Of the *Third*, the First Canon ordained, respecting papal election, that if the Cardinals should not be unanimous in their choice, two-thirds of the votes, and not less than two-thirds, should be sufficient. Of the *Fourth*, the most important Canons have been mentioned in various places.

Popes.	Died.	Eminent Persons connected with Ecclesiastical History.	Important Councils.
Clement IV. . .	1268	Thomas Aquinas.	XIV. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Second of Lyons</i> (1274), under Gregory X.
Gregory X. . .	1276	Bonaventura.	
Innocent V. . .	1276	Roger Bacon.	
Adrian V. . .	1276		
John XXI. . .	1277	Matthew Paris.	
Nicholas III. . .	1280		
Martin IV. . .	1285		
Honorius IV. . .	1288		
Nicholas IV. . .	1292		
Celestine V. (abdicated)	1294		
Boniface VIII. . .	1303	Philip the Fair.	XV. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Council of Vienne</i> (1311), under Clement V.
Benedict XI. . .	1304	Dante.	
Clement V. . .	1314	Louis of Bavaria.	
John XXII. . .	1334	John Duns Scotus.	
		William Occam.	
Benedict XII. . .	1342	Marsilius of Padua.	
Clement VI. . .	1352	Jovanni and Matteo Villani.	
Innocent VI. . .	1362	Petrarch.	
		St. Brigida.	
Urban V. . .	1370	John Wiclif.	
Gregory IX. . .	1378	St. Catharine of Sienna.	
Urban VI. (<i>Rome</i>)	1389	Theodoric of Niem.	
Clement VII. (<i>Avignon</i> .)	1394		
Boniface IX. (<i>Rome</i> .)	1404		
Innocent VII. (<i>Rome</i> .)	1406		
Benedict XIII. (<i>deposed, Avignon</i> .)	1409		
Gregory XII. (<i>deposed, Rome</i> .)	1409	Pierre d'Ailly.	Pisa (1407).
Alexander V. . .	1410	Nicholas de Clemangis.	XVI. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Constance</i> (1414).
John XXIII. . .	1415	John Gerson.	
Deposition and Vacancy till 1417.		John Huss.	
		Jerome of Prague.	
		Sigismond.	
		Poggio of Florence.	
Martin V. . .	1431	Leonardus Aretinus.	XVII. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Basle</i> (1431).
		Julian Cesarini.	
Eugenius IV. . .	1447	The Cardinal of Arles.	
Schism.		Æneas Sylvius.	
		Laurentius Valla.	
Nicholas V. . .	1455	St. Antoninus, A.B. of	
Calixtus III. . .	1458	Florence.	
Pius II. . .	1464	John of Wesalia.	
Paul II. . .	1471	John Wesselus.	
Sixtus IV. . .	1484	John Laillier.	
Innocent VIII. . .	1492	Jerome Savonarola.	
Alexander VI. . .	1503	Cardinal Ximenes.	XVIII. (<i>Latin</i>). <i>Fifth Lateran</i> , by Julius II. (1512.)
Pius III. . .	1503	Erasmus.	
Julius II. . .	1513		
Leo X. . .		Luther.	

I N D E X

- ABBESSES**, 400
Abbots, their office, 383
Abelard, account of, 327 ; his disputes with St. Bernard, 328
Adamites, the, a sect of Bohemian fanatics, 599
Adrian I., 223
 — IV. (Nicholas Breakspeare) 311
Ælia Capitolina, new city founded by Adrian from the ruins of Jerusalem, 6
Æneas Sylvius (Piccolomini) espouses the pretensions of the pope after advocating the imperial claims, 638 ; account of him, 639 ; raised to the pontificate on the death of Calixtus III., with the name of Pius II., ib. ; convokes the council of Mantua for a crusade against the Turks, 640 ; an embassy from the East arrives at Rome, 641 ; Pius canonizes St. Catharine of Sienna, ib. ; discourages attempts at reform in the church, formerly advocated by him, 642 ; recants his early opinions, ib. ; his exertions against the Turks, 643 ; and death, ib.
Agapæ, or Love Feasts, 27
Ailly, Pierre d', cardinal of Cambrai, an advocate for reform in the church, 549
Albigensis, or Albigenses, sect of, 355, 707 ; Bossuet's error respecting them, 705, *note*
Alexander III. excommunicates Frederic Barbarossa, 313 ; encourages learning, 314
 — V. (Peter of Candia) elected by the council of Pisa in opposition to the two antipopes, 529 ; his death, 530
 — VI. (Roderic Borgia, nephew of Calixtus III.), his infamous character, 650 ; elected on the death of Sixtus IV., 651 ; enters into negotiations with Bajazet against Charles VIII. of France, 652 ; his donation of the Indies to Ferdinand and Isabella, ib. ; its validity contested by the Portuguese, 653 ; he retires to the Castle of St. Angelo on Charles's entry into Rome, ib. ; is suspected of poisoning Zizini, the brother of Bajazet, 654 ; his death occasioned by a scheme of his own for poisoning a cardinal, 655
Alexandria, introduction of Christianity at, 15
Ambrose, St., account of, 137
Ammianus Marcellinus, account of, 119
Anchorets, 365
Andrew, St., his relics brought from Greece by Palæologus, 541
Angelo, St., cardinal of. See *Cesarini*
Annates, or first year's income of vacant benefices, disputes relative to, between the pope and the council of Constance, 563 ; restored after being abolished by the Pragmatic Sanction, 663, *note*
Anselm, his writings, 327, *note*
Ansgarius introduces Christianity into Denmark and Sweden in the ninth century, 269
Ante-Nicene Church, 199
Anthony, St., monachism instituted by, 365 ; also nunneries, 372
Antioch, church of, 7
Antoninus Pius, his edicts in favour of the Christians, 47
 — Marcus, his strict persecution of the Christians, 47 ; his character, 48
Apocrisiarii, papal envoys, 156
Apollinaris, bishop of Laodiceæ, his opinions regarding the Incarnation, 181
Apostles' Creed, 27
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 472
Arian Controversy, 90 ; decided by the council of Nice, 93
Arians, divisions among them, 97 ; Semi-Arians, ib. ; character of the Arians, 102
Arianism, opposed by Theodosius the Great, 99 ; spreads among the Goths, 100 ; extirpated from Spain by the council of Toledo, 101
Arius, account of, 90
Arles, cardinal of, president of the council of Basle, 574 ; his death, 636
Armenians, their negotiations with the pope, after separating from the Greek church, 628 ; Leo expresses to Innocent IV. a desire for a re-union with the Latin church, 629 ; doctrinal errors imputed to them by the pontiff, 630
Arnold of Brescia, an early reformer, 311 ; put to death, 312 ; political as well as religious reformer, 714, *note*
Artemon, his heresy, 67
Ascetics, 364
Asia, the seven churches of, 8
Asylum, practice of, 697
Athanasian Creed, 219
Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, account of, 95 ; banished by Constantius, 96 ; Julian's enmity to him, 117
Athens, progress of Christianity at, 11

- Avignon, removal of the papal see to, by Clement V., 478; decline of the papal power at this period, 493; one of its causes the profligacy of the court of Avignon, 494
- Augustin, St., bishop of Hippo, opposes the Donatists, 168; account of him, 170; Erasmus's parallel between him and St. Jerome, 172; his private life, 173; opposes the doctrines of Celestius, 178; and those of Pelagianism, 179
- hermits of, a religious order, 393
- Auricular confession established, 267
- Austin, St., introduces Christianity into England, 143; Jortin's character of him, 144, *note*
- Bajaset, offer of alliance made to him by Alexander VI., 652; his brother Zisini detained as a hostage by Alexander, and supposed to have been poisoned by him, 654
- Baptism, sacrament of, 27; efficacy imputed to it, 37
- Basil, St., archbishop of Cæsarea, introduces monachism into the Greek church, 368
- Basle, council of, convoked, 565; its objects, 566; contentious with Eugenius IV., 567; its articles of reformation, 570; final breach with the pope, 572; the president, cardinal of St. Angelo, deserts to the pontiff, 573; questions as to the legitimacy of the council, *ib.*; it deposes Eugenius, 574; and elects Amadeus, duke of Savoy (Felix V.), 575; and dissolves itself, *ib.*; general principles of this council and that of Constance, 579
- Beghards, a sect so called, 502
- Benedict of Aniane, 265; founds a more rigid institution of monachism, 378
- , St., of Murcia, founder of an order of monks, 375; its rule, *ib.*
- XII. attempts to reform some of the abuses in the church and the monastic orders, 486
- XIII. (Peter of Luna, a Spaniard) elected on the death of Clement VII., 521; refuses to accede to the measures proposed for healing the schism in the church, *ib.*; the French court withdraws its obedience, 523; persists in asserting his authority in opposition to the decision of the council of Constance, 539; he is deposed, 541; his death and character, 543
- Benefices, foundation of, 228
- Benincasa, Ursula, the Ursuline nuns derive their title from her, 401
- Berenger, archdeacon of Angers, opposes the doctrine of transubstantiation, 293; twice retracts his opinions, and again returns to them, 294
- Bernard, St., account of, 325; his writings, 326; his disputation with Abelard, 328; his zeal in support of papal authority, 329; censures appeal to the see of Rome, 331; declaims against the degeneracy of the clergy, 333; his character, 334; his character of the Romans, 339; preaches against Henry (founder of the Henricians), 350; preaches the second crusade, 453
- Bishops, their office and authority in the early church, 23; their oppressive conduct, 161; their gradual assumption of power, 216; translation of bishops prohibited in the ninth century, 266
- Bohemia, religious insurrection in, 598; sect of the Thaborites, 599; the Adamites massacred by Zisca, *ib.*; embassy to the council of Basle for the purpose of healing religious dissensions, 600; the Calixtins, *ib.*; renewal of the war, 601; the reformers concede most of their claims by the compact of Iglas, 602; the pope refuses to agree to the concordat, *ib.*; Pogebrac deposed by Paul II., 603; sect of the United Brethren, *ib.*; the schismatics of Bohemia invited to enter into a union with the Greek church, 627
- Bonaventura, St., theological writer, 473
- Boniface VIII., his ambition and insolence, 432; his temporal pretensions, 433; lays claim to Scotland, *ib.*; his disputes with Philip the Fair of France, 435; publishes a bull against him, which the other burnes, 436; persists in summoning the French clergy to Rome, 437; his bull *Unam Sanctam*, *ib.*; he is seized by the French, 438; his singular death, 440
- IX. (Pietro Tomacelli) elected on the death of Urban VI., 518; his avarice, *ib.*; permits Cologne and Magdeburg to hold a jubilee, 519; promises to resign on condition of Benedict XIII. doing the same, 522; his government, 524; his death, 526
- Borgia Rodrigo. See *Alexander VI.*
- Cæsar, natural son of the preceding, quits the ecclesiastical profession and is made duke Valentino, 654; in danger of being poisoned at the same time with his father, 655; he promotes the election of Julius II., 657
- Bourges, council of, which fixes the liberties of the Gallican church, convoked by Charles VII., 576; the Pragmatic Sanction passed by it, 577
- Brescia, Angela di, founder of the Ursuline nuns, 401
- Bruno, St., founds the order of La Chartreuse, 381
- Bruys, Pierre de, an early reformer, and founder of the sect of Petrobrussians, burnt alive, 350
- Burgundians, converted to Christianity, 121, *note*
- Calixtins, sect of reformers in Bohemia, 600
- Calixtus II. appoints a diet at Worms for settling the disputes regarding Investiture, 308
- III. (Alphonso Borgia) succeeds Nicholas V., 637; introduces the system of Nepotism, 638

- Calumnies against the early Christians, 53
Cambalu (Pekin), see of, founded by Clement V., 699
Canonization, first instance of, 641, *note*
Canons, regular and secular, 384
Capucines, order of, 396, *note*
Cardinals, college of, 273; rise and progress of their power, 677; Muratori's explanation of the origin of the title, *ib.*, *note*; institution of the conclave, 678
Carmelites, order of, 393
Catechumens, one of the two classes of a congregation, 37
Cathari, sect of, 352
Catharine, St., of Sienna, 400; her fanaticism, 491; sent on a mission to Gregory XI., *ib.*; supports the claims of Urban VI. against Clement VII., 516
Celestine V. (Pietro di Morone), the hermit pope, succeeds Nicholas IV., 429; his character and incapacity, 430; resigns his office, 431; kept in prison for the rest of his life by his successor Boniface VIII., 432
Celibacy, 38, *note*
—— of the clergy, 210
Cesarini, Julian, cardinal of St. Angelo, president of the council of Basle, refuses to transfer it to Bologna, 566; his zeal for reform in the Catholic church, 568; passes over to the papal party, 573; distinguishes himself at the council of Ferrara, 621; killed at the battle of Varna, 625, *note*
Charlemagne, his liberality to the church, 164; his Capitulary for the reform of the clergy, 165; extends their jurisdiction, 222; corrects the discipline of the church, 264
Charles Martel, his victory over the Saracens, 147
—— the Bald dispossesses his brother Lothaire, with the sanction of the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, 245; Adrian II. endeavours to exclude him from his succession, 246
—— VIII. of France, alliance against him between Alexander VI. and Bajazet, 652; he enters Rome, 653; does homage to Alexander, *ib.*; Savonarola's interview with him, 715
Chartreuse, or Carthusian order, 381
Christians, the early, their unpopularity, and the calumnies and charges against them, 52, &c.
Chrysostom, St. John, account of, 138; his doctrine, 140
Church, difference between Eastern and Western, 158; schism between the Greek and Latin churches, 193; the Ante-Nicene church, 199; the church in connexion with the state, 214; its internal administration, 216; general benefits derived from the church, 232. See *Roman Catholic church*.
Church government, 20; at the beginning of the third century, 35; ditto fourth ditto, 79; alterations in it under Constantine, and its alliance with the state, 81; abuses in the church in latter times, 480
Circumcellions, 168
Cistercian order of monks, 380
Claudius, bishop of Turin, a reformer in the ninth century, 268
Clement V., archbishop of Bourdeaux, conditions imposed upon him by Philip the Fair, 477; removes the papal see to Avignon, 478; appoints a council at Vienne to inquire into the conduct of the Templars, *ib.*; his death and wealth, 481, *note*
—— VI. shortens the period of the Jubiles to fifty years, 487; his quarrels with Louis of Bavaria, 488; his profligate character, 489
—— VII. elected at Fondi by the cardinals, in opposition to Urban VI., 514; acknowledged in France, 515; his death, 520
Clergy, origin of the distinction between them and the laity, 22; Charlemagne's reform of the clergy, 165; jurisdiction of the clergy, 221; extended by Charlemagne, 222; condition and morals in the ninth century, 319; their general immorality, 696
Clovis, king of the Franks, converted to Christianity, 120
Cluni, monastic order of, founded, 380
Cœnobites, 367
Communion, the cup forbidden to the laity, 691
Community of property among the early Christians doubtful, 25
Conclave, the, institution of, 678
Concubinage of the clergy, 696
Confession introduced by St. Leo, 126; established, 267, 348
Constance, council of, convoked by John XXIII. to settle the schism in the church and papacy, 532; it declares for the cession of the three popes, 535; further account of the proceedings of this council, 553; it appoints a college of reform, 554; it is dissolved, 563
Constantine the Great, 76; his character, 78; constitution of the church in his time, 79; alterations introduced into it, 81; his division of its administration, 82; state of Christianity and paganism in his reign, 105; his edict of toleration, 106
Constantius patronises Arianism, 95; removes Athanasius, 96; convokes the council of Rimini, 98
Controversies, religious, their origin, 89
Corinth, establishment of Christianity at, 11
Councils and Synods, origin of, 24
——, Nice, 91; second ditto, 188; Rimini, 98; Constantinople, 99; Chalcedon, 125; fourth council of Carthage, 130; Toledo, 159; Placentia, 303; Clermont, 304; the first Lateran, 310; Vienne, 479; Constance, 532; Ferrara, 573
——, general, remarks on, 189
Creeds, 26; the Apostles' Creed, 27

- Cross**, sign of, efficacy imputed to, 38
 — inscription of the true, pretended to be found at Rome, 695
- Crusades**, origin of, 304; account of, 452; St. Bernard preaches the second crusade, 453; subsequent crusades, 454; those of St. Lewis, 455; causes of the crusades, 456; favoured by the superstitious zeal of the times, 459; objects of the first crusade, 460; of the others, *ib.*; policy of the popes in regard to them, 461; decline of the crusading spirit, 462; effects of the crusades, 463; privileges of crusades, *ib.*, *note*; the crusades productive of intolerance, 465
- Cyprian**, bishop of Carthage, 35; his zeal in behalf of episcopal power, 36; his martyrdom, 50
- Cyril**, patriarch of Alexandria, opposes the doctrine of Nestorius, 182
- Dæmoniæ**, 204
- Damascenus**, John, last of the Greek fathers, 191
- Dancers**, sect of, in Belgium, 546
- Dauphiné**, protestants in, 707, *note*
- Deacons**, their office, 22
- Dead**, prayers for, first introduced, 38
- Decretals**, papal, 467; Gratian's collection of, 468; that of Circa, bishop of Faenza, *ib.*, and of Gregory IX., *ib.*
 —, the false, 223, 286; rejected by the Greek church, 612
- Denmark**, Christianity introduced into, in the ninth century, 269
- Diocletian**, his persecution, 51
- Dionysius**, bishop of Corinth, his epistles, 12
- Docetæ**, sect of, 64
- Dominic**, St., 388
- Dominicans**, 390, 391; their dispute with the university of Paris, *ib.*
- Donation of Constantine**, the forgery so called, 224
- Donatists**, the, 167; persecuted by Constans, 168; their influence lessened by Augustin, *ib.*; decision against them by the conference of Carthage, 169; their doctrine, *ib.*; frequency of suicide among them, 170
- Double procession**, the, account of, 196
- Dulcinus**, his heresy, 503; and death, 504
- Easter**, disputes respecting the celebration of, 14
- Ebionites**, their doctrines, 65
- Eclectics**, sect of, 39
- Education and theological learning**, 316
- Ecclesiastical property**, 335
- Egypt**, monks of, 365
- Election**, papal, independence of, 237; regulations regarding, passed by the second council of Lyons, 427
- Eligius**, St., bishop of Noyon, specimen of his sermons, 298
- Encratites**, sect of, 64
- England**, Christianity introduced into, 143; spiritual jurisdiction in, 682, *note*
- Ephesus**, church of, 8; council of, 182
- Epiphanius**, bishop of Salamis, 105
- Episcopal government**, earliest form of, 23
- Erasmus**, 717
- Eucharist**, sacrament of, 27
- Euchites**, a sect of mystics in the Greek church, 608
- Eugenius IV.** succeeds Martin V., 565; his character, *ib.*; his disputes with the council of Basle, 567; the intrigues of his legate to thwart its measures for reform, 572; he appoints a council at Ferrara, 573; is deposed by that of Basle, 575
- Eusebius**, account of, 86
- Eutyches**, opposes Nestorius, 184; condemned by the council of Chalcedon, *ib.*
- Exorcism**, 203
- Fathers**, the apostolical, 71
- Felix V.** (Amadeus, duke of Savoy) elected on the deposition of Eugenius IV. by the council of Basle, 575; but resigns after the election of Nicholas V., *ib.*
- Ferrara**, council of, convoked by Eugenius IV. in opposition to that of Basle, 573; deputies from the Greek church arrive to settle the differences between the two churches, 621
- Festivals**, the two first, 26
- Flagellants**, the, account of, 504; eight thousand massacred by the Teutonic order, 505
- Forgeries**, religious, 38, 204
- France**, Christianity introduced into, 14
- Francis**, St., of Assisi, founder of the Franciscan order, 389; his stigmata, 693
- Franciscans**, order of, 389; dissensions among them, 392
- Frederic Barbarossa**, his jealousy of the papal authority, 312; sets up the antipope Octavian, 313
- II. engages to make a crusade, 415; his letter to Henry III. of England, accusing the Roman see of rapacity, 416; proceeds to Palestine, 417; deposed by Innocent IV., his former adherent, 419; his death and character, *ib.*
- Frisingensis**, Otho, introduces the scholastic method into Germany, 471, *note*
- Gallican church**, its independence founded by Lewis IX., 450
- Germany**, progress of Christianity in, 144; the abuses of the church particularly displayed in, 718
- Gerson**, chancellor of the university of Paris, exposes the vices of the clergy, 550; attacks the decretals, &c., 553; exhorts to severity against the Bohemian schismatics, 589, *note*
- Gladiatorial games** abolished by Honorius, 116
- Gnosticism**, 61
- Gnostics**, their doctrines, 62
- Godeschalcus**, his opinions, 258; tried before a council at Mayence, 259

- Gospel, the Eternal, account of the work so called, 507
- Goths, early converts to Christianity, 120
- Gratian, his collection of decretals, 467
- Greek church, its history after its separation from the Latin, 604; persecution against the Paulicians, 605; heresies imputed to them, 606; prevalence of mysticism in the east, 607; Euchites, or Messalians, 608; Hesychasts, or Quietists, 609; the sect of Bogomiles founded by Basilus, 610; distinctions between the Greek and the Latin church, 611; the reverence of the former for antiquity, 613; dominion of the Latins in Constantinople, 614; the Latin communion established there, 615; the chief of the Greek church retire to Nice, 616; Latin mission to Nice, 617
- Gregory Nazianzen, 136
- the Great, 149; Jortin's character of him, *ib.*, *note*; maintains the doctrine of purgatory, 151, 212; his reverence for relics, 152; canon of the mass instituted by him, 153
- VII. (see *Hildebrand*) interdicts the marriage of the clergy, 277, and simony, 278; excommunicates the emperor Henry IV., 281; his temporal usurpations, 283; his objects in the internal administration of the church, 286; avails himself of the false decretals, *ib.*; his double scheme of universal dominion, 287; liberated from Henry, who enters Rome, by Robert Guiscard, 288; dies at Salerno, 289; his character, *ib.*; the Latin liturgy established by him, 295
- IX., his splendid coronation, 415; excommunicates Frederic II. for not proceeding to his crusades, 416; persists in persecuting him, 417
- X. elected while in Palestine, 425; endeavours to reconcile the Greek and Latin church, 426; his death, 427
- XI., St. Catherine of Sienna sent on a mission to him, 491; violence of the populace, and of party in conclave after his death, 510
- XII., Angelo Corrario, titular patriarch of Constantinople, succeeds Innocent VII., 527; refuses to heal the schism in the church, caused by the pretensions of the antipopes, *ib.*; the cardinals convoke the council of Pisa, 528; and elect Alexander V., 529
- Hale, Albert, the irrefragable doctor, 473, *note*
- Henricians, the sect of, 350
- Henry IV., emperor, calls a council at Worms, which deposes Gregory VII., 280; is excommunicated by him, 281; does penance at Canossa, *ib.*; elects an antipope, Clement III., 288; enters Rome, but is expelled by the Normans, *ib.*; his misfortunes and death, 305
- Henry V., son of the preceding, quarrels with Paschal II., and takes him prisoner, 307
- Heresy, origin of the term, 581
- Heretics, early, their numbers, 59; three classes of, 61; various heretical sects in the twelfth century, 350; treatment of heretics, 709; canon of the fourth Lateran council against, *ib.*
- Hermits of St. Augustine, order of, 393
- Hesychasts, or Quietists, sect of, in Greece, 609
- Hierapolis, bishops of, 9
- Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, 105
- Hildebrand, a monk of Cluni, carried to Rome by Leo IX., 272; his policy for extending the papal power, 275; succeeds Alexander II., 276. See *Gregory VII.*
- Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, asserts the independence of the church against Lewis III., 247; his character, 252
- Honorius, gladiatorial games abolished by, 116
- III., 415
- Host, elevation of the, 691
- Hungary, Christianity first introduced into, 270
- Huss, John, account of, 585; summoned by the Council of Constance, 586; his opinions and attachment to those of Wiclif, *ib.*; imprisoned by the Council of Constance, 590; accused, 591; his trial; 592; condemnation, 593; and execution, 595
- Iconoclasts, 188
- Ignatius, St., bishop of Antioch, 7; his epistle to the Smyrnians, 8; his writings, 72
- Images, use of, 151; controversy on, 187; edict of Constantine Copronymus against, 188; restored by the empress Irene, *ib.*; the emperor Michael attempts to discard them, 190; their worship restored by Theodora, 191
- Immorality, general, of the clergy, 696
- Incarnation, the, controversy on, 181
- Indulgence, plenary, traffic in, 466
- adopted by Boniface IX., 518; remarks on, 674
- Infallibility of the Pope, 673
- Innocent III., his pontificate, 335; lays France under interdict, for Philippe Auguste refusing to take back his divorced bride, 343; excommunicates the English king, John, 345; imposes the Saladin tax, 346; convokes the fourth Lateran council, 347; urges Simon de Montfort against the heretics, 358; his death and character, 359; his policy in regard to the crusades, 461; his apprehension of the mystics, 708
- IV., excommunicates and deposes Frederic II. in the council of Lyons, 418; his conduct, 422; and character, 424; establishes the Inquisition in the North of Italy, 447

- Innocent VI.**, his dispute with the German clergy, 489
 — VIII. succeeds Sixtus IV., 649; violates the engagements made at his election, *ib.*; pensious his illegitimate children on the Apostolical treasury, *ib.*; succeeded by Alexander VI., 650
Inquisition, the, 445; the title of Inquisitors first given to the emissaries of Innocent III., 446
Interdicts, papal, 343, *note*
Intolerance of the ancient Romans, 43
Investiture, 279; right of, extorted from Paschal II. by Henry V., 307; conclusion of the quarrels regarding it, 308
Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, account of, 73
James, St., first bishop of Jerusalem, 5
Jerome, St., account of, 141; Erasmus's parallel between him and St. Augustine, 172
Jerome of Prague, disciple of Huss, tried before the council of Prague, 596; and executed, 597
Jerusalem, the Latin kingdom of, 613
 — church of, 6
John XXII., succeeds Clement V., after a lapse of two years, 481; his avarice and rapacity, 482; he extends the power of the Apostolical Chancery, *ib.*; his contest with Louis of Bavaria, who appoints a new pope, Nicholas V., 483; John formally charged with heresy, by the assembly of Milan, 484; his death, 485
 — XXIII., (Baltazar Cossa) succeeds Alexander V., 530; consents to a council for deciding the schism in the church, 531; and abdicates, 535; escapes from Constance, 536; is given up by the duke of Austria, 537; is deposed, 538; acknowledges Martin V., 544; his character, 545
Jovinian, his character of St. Austin, 144, *note*; of Gregory the Great, 149, *ditto*
Jovinian, his attempt to reform monastic asceticism, 175
Jubilee, institution of the, 467
Julian the Apostate, 107; his efforts to restore paganism, 108; and to reform it, 109; attempts to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, 110; his writings, 117
Julius II., (Julian della Rovera) a candidate for the papal crown, with Roderic Borgia, 651; attaches himself to Charles VIII., 653; succeeds Pius III., 657; his military character, *ib.*; his patronage of the arts, 659; he excommunicates a council convoked by same cardinals at Pisa, 660; convokes the fifth Lateran council, *ib.*; dies, *ib.*; his character and policy, 669
Justin Martyr, 72
Justinian, account of, 126; his edict against the schools at Athens, 132
Knights of the Hospital, 386
 — Templars, 387
Lactantius, his character as a writer, 135
Laillier, John, a reformer, his disputations with the Sorbonne, 713
Lateran councils, 335; the fourth, 347; the fifth convoked by Julius II., 661; its canons of reformation, 661; its decree against the press, 662; the council dissolved, 663
Lay brethren in monasteries, institution of, 382
Learning, state of, after the subversion of the western empire, 318
Leo the Great, 124; introduces private confession, 126
 — the Isaurian, (emperor) attempts to abolish idolatrous worship, 187
 — IX., attempt at church reform by, 272
 — X., (see *Medici, Giovanni de'*) succeeds Julius II., 661; his decree against the press, 662; he abolishes the Pragmatic Sanction, *ib.*; degradation of the sacred college, 665; Leo's unfitness for stemming the reformation, 720
Lewis the Meek, deposed by his sons, and subjected to ignominious ecclesiastical penance, 244
 — IX., (St.) account of, 441; obtains the original crown of thorns, 443; his death, 444; canonized by Boniface VIII., 445
Libanius, his apology for paganism, 114, *note*
Literature, decline of, 129; the clergy interdicted from secular literature, 130; state of learning before the tenth century, 261
 — Christian, in the third century, 40, *note*
 — theological, three æras of, 323
Liturgy, the Latin, established by Gregory VII., 295
Lollards, their origin and opinions, 502, horrible doctrines imputed to them, *ib.*, *note*
Louis of Bavaria, his contest with John XXII., against whom he sets up another pope, 483; his disputes with Clement VI., 488; patronizes the enemies of papacy, 500
Lyons, first council of, deposes Frederic II., 418; second *ditto*, 426; law respecting the election of popes, 427
 — second council for reconciling the Greek and Latin churches, 619
Lucian, his account of the early Christians, 30
Mahomet, his conquests, 145
Manes, his system, 708, *note*
Mantua, council of, convened by Pius II., to form a crusade against the Turks, 640
Manuscripts, scarcity of, in the middle ages, 321
Mark, St., preaches at Alexandria, 15
Maronites, the, account of, 631
Marriage of the clergy prohibited, 277
Martin, St., (pope) carried captive to Constantinople, 162

- Martin, St.** (of Tours) 174
 — IV., miracles said to be worked at his tomb, 428
 — V., elected during the session of the council of Constance, 557; he eludes the articles of reform proposed by it, 562
Martyrs, veneration for, 114
Mass, canon of the, instituted by Gregory the Great, 153
Masses, private, 690
Mayence, diet of, 576
Medici, Lorenzo de', excommunicated by Sixtus IV., 647
 — Giovanni, son of the preceding, made cardinal by Innocent VIII., at the age of thirteen, 650, *note*; succeeds Julius II., by the title of Leo X., 661
Melito, bishop of Sardis, his works, 9
Mendicants, order of, 388; their early merits, and subsequent degeneracy, 394; dispute in England between them and the clergy, *ib.*, *note*; their contest with the curés about confession, 503
Metropolitans, decline of their power, 160
Millennium, opinions regarding, 40; general expectation of, in the tenth century, 260
Minimes, order of, founded by Francisco of Paula, and confirmed by Sixtus IV., 648
Minorites, or Fratricelli, the, condemned by John XXII. as heretics, 498; persecuted by the Inquisition, 499
Miracles, pretended, 19, *note*; remarks on the cessation of miracles, *ib.*; ditto false miracles, 692
Miraculous claims of the early church, 19
Missionaries, the mendicants distinguished as, 699
Monachism, its origin, and progress in the East, 363; monks of Egypt, 365; of Syria, 368; early forms of monachism, 370; character of it in the East, 371; introduced in the West, 372; its prevalence and character there, 374; account of the Rule of St. Benedict, 375; progress of monachism in the West, 377; order of Cluni, 380; general remarks on monachism, 402; successive reformations in the system, 404; advantages produced by it, 406; superstition encouraged by it, 411; the monastic orders gradually become dependent on the pope, 412; their wealth, 413; principles of monachism, 698
Monothelites, 185
Montanists, their doctrines, 69
Monte Cassino, celebrated monastery of, 377
Montfort, Simon de, commissioned to extirpate the heretics, 358
Morality of the primitive church, 28; begins to decline, 36
Morals, state of, during the fourth and fifth centuries, 133
Mosheim, his garbled extracts from St. Eligius, 298
Mysticism, prevalence of in the East, 607; remarks on, 700; the mystics oppose the scholastics, *ib.*; mysticism prevails in the Catholic church, 708
Nepotism, system of, 638
Nero, his persecution against the Christians, 42
Nestorianism, spread of, 183
Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, 181; excommunicated by Cyril and the council of Ephesus, 182
Nice, council of, 91
Nicholas II., elected in opposition to the Roman nobility, &c., 273; his edict in regard to future elections, *ib.*
 — III., 427
 — V., (Thomas of Sarzana) elected on the death of Eugenius IV., the deposed pope, and Felix V. resigns, 575; his patronage of literature and the arts, 634; founds the Vatican library, *ib.*; makes a concordat with the German church, 635; his efforts to recover Constantinople from the Turks, 636; his death, 637
Nogaret, William of, seizes Boniface VIII., 438
Normans, converted to Christianity, 271
Novatians, sect of, 70
Nunneries, institution of, attributed to St. Anthony, 372
Nuns, establishment of, 397; origin of the name, 398, *note*; their vow of chastity, *ib.*; Benedictine nuns, 399; canonesses, 400; nuns of the hospital, *ib.*; of the Holy Trinity, *ib.*; of St. Dominic, *ib.*; of St. Brigida, 401; Ursulines, *ib.*
Olive, Pierre d', his work against the Romish Church, 508
Orders, monastic, St. Benedict, 375; Cluni, 380; Cistercian, *ib.*; La Chartreuse, 381; St. Dominic, 388; St. Francis, 389
 — military, 385; knights of the hospital, 386; Templars, 387; Teutonic order, *ib.*
Ordination, rite of, in the early church, 23, *note*
Origen, account of, 33; his theological system, 34
Osma, Peter of, a Spanish reformer, 714, *note*
Otho the Great, reassumes the imperial authority in regard to papal elections, 238; bestows ecclesiastical investiture, 279
Paganism, its decline and fall, 105; Julian's attempt to revive it, 109; a decisive blow given to it by Theodosius's edict, 113; its extinction, 116; its influence on Christianity, 212
Papacy, elements of, 154; the papal principle, 162
Papal power, increase of, 223; pretensions of the popes for interfering with the succession to the imperial throne, 248; internal usurpation of the Roman see, 249

- Papias, the father of traditions, and the originator of the doctrine of the millennium, 40
- Paris, University of, 469
- Paschal II., 305; his dispute with the emperor Henry V., 306; made prisoner by him, 307
- Paul II. succeeds Pius II., 645; diverts the war against the Turks to persecution of the Hussites, *ib.*; discourages literature as dangerous to the church, 646; his death, *ib.*
- Paulicians, sect of heretics in the Greek church, 352, 604; numbers of them destroyed in the reign of Theodora, 605; their opinions, *ib.*
- Pelagian controversy, the, 176
- Pelagianism, 179
- Pelagius, account of, 177
- Pepin, his donation to the church, 163
- Persecutions against the Christians: Nero's, 42; Domitian's, 45; Trajan's rescript favourable to them, 46; Marcus Antoninus's, 47; Severus's, 49; Decius's, *ib.*; Valerian's, 50; Diocletian's, 51; indirect advantages of these persecutions, 57
- Peter, the Lombard theological writer, 471; his book of the sentences, 472
- Petrobrussians, followers of Pierre de Bruys, 350.
- Philip the Fair of France, his disputes with Boniface VIII., 435; he burns the Pope's bull, 436 conditions imposed by him on Clement V. whose election he favours, 477; causes all the Templars in his dominions to be seized, 478; and several to be burnt alive, 479
- Photius succeeds Ignatius as patriarch of Constantinople, 197; charges the Romish church with heresy, *ib.*; deposed and recalled, 198
- Piccolomini, Æneas Sylvius, (Pius II.) see *Æneas*
- Pilgrimages, 228, *note*, 457.
- Pisa, council of, convened by the Cardinals, to settle the schism in the church, 528; it elects Alexander V., in opposition to Benedict XIII., and Gregory XII. 529; character and results of this assembly, 552
- Pius II., see *Æneas Sylvius*
- Pius III., elected as successor to Alexander VI., but dies almost immediately afterwards, 657
- Platonics, new, sect of, 39
- Plenary Indulgence, 466
- Pliny the younger, his account of the early Christians, 10
- Poland, Christianity first introduced into, 270
- Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, 8
- Polytheism, character of, 41; its intolerance among the Romans, 43
- Popes, when they first assumed new names on their election, 267; regulations as to their election, 273; which becomes independent of the imperial sanction, 274
- Pragmatic Sanction, the, passed by the Council of Bourges, 577; annulled and afterwards restored by Louis XI., 647; abolished by Leo X., 662
- Praxeas, his heresy, 67
- Priscillian, Spanish bishop, put to death, 174
- Priscillianists, the, 173
- Prophets, class of ministers so called, 21
- Protestantism, attempts to trace its opinions back to the apostolical times, 705; no historical proofs in their favour, 708
- Provincial Synods, 35
- Prussia, Christianity introduced into, by the Teutonic order, 387
- Purgatory, belief in, inculcated by Gregory the Great, 151, 212; disputation on at the Council of Ferrara, 621; doctrine of, 674, 688
- Radbert, Paschasius, his doctrine of the real presence, 257
- Ratramn, appointed to examine the opinions of Radbert, 257
- Reform, college of, appointed by the council of Constance, 554
- Reformation: attempts at self-reformation in the Romish church, 548; general complaints against abuses, 549; council of Pisa appointed for measures of reform, 552; of Constance, ditto, 553; college of reform appointed by it, 554; futility of the plan of reform, 557; articles of reformation, 559, 571; restrictions upon the pope, *ib.*; this scheme of reformation eluded by Martin V., 562; council of Basle, 565; its contest with Eugenius IV., 567; its articles of reformation, 570; final breach with the pope, 572; nature of the reform attempted by the church itself, 702
- Reformers, early papal, Claudius of Turin, 268; Berenger, 295; Arnold of Brescia, 311; John of Wesalia, 712; Wesselus, *ib.*; Laillier, 713; Savonarola, 714; Reuchlin, 717; Erasmus, *ib.*
- Relics, superstitious reverence for, 152
- Reuchlin a reformer, 717
- Revenues of the church, 224
- Riario, Pietro, favourite nephew of Sixtus IV., his prodigality, 648
- Roman people, their character in the middle ages, 338
- Roman Catholic church, its power and constitution, 668; secular authority of the popes, 670; spiritual supremacy of Rome, 670; infallibility of the pope, 673; his dispensing power, 674; penance and purgatory, *ib.*; claims of the popes to universal temporal supremacy, 675; the cardinals and conclave, 677; relative power of the cardinals and the pope, 679; general councils, *ib.*; various causes of the influence of Romanism, 680; policy of the Vatican, 682; mediatorial character of the Romish priesthood, 684; power arising to the church from a plebeian order of clergy, 685; doctrines of the Romish church,

- 668; penance, 687; indulgences, *ib.*; purgatory, 688; discipline and morals, 696; benefits conferred by the Roman Catholic church, 697
- Rome, persecutions at, under Nero, 12; emperors favourable to Christianity, 33, *note*
- Rome, church of, authority early claimed by, 33; causes of the increase of the authority of the Roman see, 217
- Russia, Christianity first introduced into, 270
- Sabellius, his heresy, 68
- Saccas, Ammonius, founder of the Eclectics or new Platonists, 39
- Sacraments of the primitive church, 27
- Saladin tax, the, imposed by Innocent III. on church property, 346
- Sarabaites, a kind of oriental monks, 368
- Saracens, their conquests, 146
- Savonarola, Jerome, Italian reformer, 714; his interview with Charles VIII. 715; and execution, 717
- Schism of the Roman Catholic church, account of, 509
- Schools, Christian, 26
- Scotus, John, appointed to examine the opinions of Radbert, 257
- Scotus, John Duns, 474
- Scriptures, the reading them prohibited, 692
- Semi-Arians, 97
- Semi-Pelagians, 180
- Sigismund, recommended as emperor by John XXIII., 531; he appoints Constance as the place for a council to decide the schism in the papal see, and on the two antipopes, *ib.*; his character, 534; opposes John's interest, 535
- Simon Magus, the heresiarch, 63
- Simony, edict against, 278
- Sixtus IV. succeeds Paul II., 646; lays Florence under interdict, and excommunicates Lorenzo de' Medici, 647; his nepotism, *ib.*; confirms the order of Minimes, 648; his character, *ib.*; and death, 649
- Socrates, the historian, 104
- Sorbounne, Robert de, 470
- Sozomen, Hermias, 104
- Spiritual courts, their jurisdiction, 337, *note* in England, 682, *note*
- Sylvester II., his encouragement of learning, 263; originates the scheme of the crusades, 304.
- Symeon the Stylite, 123
- Synesius, a platonic philosopher, made bishop, 115, *note*
- Sylvius, Æneas. See *Æneas*
- Tartary, Christianity introduced into, 145
- Tatian founds the sect of the Encratites, 64
- Templars, knights, 387; council appointed by Clement V., to inquire into their conduct, 478; Philip the Fair causes all in his dominions to be seized, *ib.*; their probable innocence, 479
- Tertullian, account of, 34
- Teutonic order, the, 387
- Theodoret, ecclesiastical historian, 104
- Theodosius the Great, his edict against paganism, 113; compelled by St. Ambrose to perform penance, 138
- Theological writers, 470
- Therapeutæ or Essenes, 463
- Thomists and Scotists, 474
- Tithes, 239; the first legally established by Charlemagne, 231; their payment not universally enforced till the end of the twelfth century, 332
- Toledo, councils of, 159
- Toulouse, councils of, 358
- Transubstantiation, Radbert's doctrine of, 257; opposed by Berenger, 295; the doctrine of, confirmed by Innocent III., 348
- Truce of God, 697
- Turks, exertions of Pius II. against, 643; and of other popes, 666
- Ulphilas, bishop, spreads the tenets of Arianism among the Goths, 100, 120
- United Brethren, sect in Bohemia, 663
- University of Paris, 469; it condemns Aristotle's metaphysical works, 472; its projects for healing the schism in the church, 519
- Urban II., 303
- Urban V. restores the papal residence from Avignon to Rome, 490
- Urban VI., archbishop of Bari, his election, 512; arraigns the bishops for their misconduct, 513; the cardinals cancel his election, 514; his cause espoused by St. Catherine of Sienna, 516; imprisons six cardinals, 517; dies at Rome, 518
- Ursuline Nuns, 401
- Valentinian I., 112
- Vaudois, or Waldenses, 353; crimes alleged against them by Rainer, 354, 355, *note*; account of them, 707; persecutions, 710, *note*
- Venturius of Bergamo, founder of a sect of fanatics, 541
- Vienne, council of, to inquire into the conduct of the Templars, &c., 479
- Vigilantius, boldly inveighs against the superstitious practices of the church, 176
- Virgin, office instituted to the, 694
- Waldenses, the, account of that sect, 353
- Waldus, Peter, account of, 353; his death, 356
- Wesalia, John of, a reformer, account of, 712
- Wesselus, John, a reformer, 712; designated the forerunner of Luther, *ib.*
- White Penitents, a sect of religious enthusiasts, 547
- Wicliff, John, account of, 582; his bones dug up by order of the council of Constance, 584; his opinions, *ib.*; his doctrines carried into Bohemia, 585

Wilfrid, St., 144, *note*Winfrid, an English missionary in Germany,
144

Ximenes, cardinal, 697

Zeno, emperor, his *Historica*, or edict of
union, 184Zisca, heads the insurgent reformers in
Bohemia, 599

Zosimus, the historian, 112

CORRIGENDA.

PAGE.	LINE.	FOR	READ
24	2	end	middle
39	44	on condition that they should be allowed to retain	at the same time that they retained
56	44	Shall I listen to your insults on our ceremonies? (the passage is obscure)	I will not thus allow insults to be introduced
—	5	Art. Scyll p. 77	Act. Scyll p. 87
58	1	three first	first three
62	5	Heretics	Heresies
64	last	xxiii. p. 197	C. vii. p. 205
76	33	<i>seurs</i>	<i>seurs</i>
81	45	three first of these	first of these three
104	2 & 33	Theodorit	Theodoret
113	49, &c.	Genadius	Gennadius
119	34	348	388
140	29	the (dele)	570
145	25	575	fifty-first
147	45	fiftieth	Constans
169	31	Constant	and
218	11	to	there
224	23	these	Synod
240	last but 1	Second	mainly
254	28	amply	assigning
270	26	ascribing	in the year 1133
310	16	in the following year	such
326	29	so	raised
328	23	formed	about
328	49	at least	variety
339	19	vanity	of
343	38	and	restless
347	20	reckless	were
350	16	was	1160
353	34, 47	1180	whom
378	last	which	(insert) other
379	29	(before) way	observant
—	39	observant	Vallombrosa
—	last	Valombrosa	impotence
389	34	importance	Sorbonne
392	20	Sorbon	decorum
399	last but 5	decorum	by them
411	28	then	(insert) throwing
414	36	(before) an	Germany
419	34	Italy	1271
425	30	1273	intended
427	23	intruded	Canis
440	last but 3	Canio	1244
447	22	1144	Novella
469	8	Novella	armies
504	2	enemies	Serignan
508	3	Sevignan	a
515	8	the	was
539	17	saw	(insert) project
558	last but 4	(before) of	some
569	12	that	persecution
592	17	prosecution	the
602	last but 2	this	(insert) any
—	last but 1	(before) inconsistency	its
685	36	that	

h, 1752-1817.

r musikalischer Katechismus, oder
llgemeinen musiklehre zum behu
hre zöglinge. Biberach, Gebrü

ooks, etc.

10-9344

MT6.K63

April 23, 1910

